

# ENGLISH STUDIES

A JOURNAL OF ENGLISH  
LETTERS AND PHILOLOGY

Edited by  
R. W. ZANDVOORT  
With a Supplement

1933

VOLUME FIFTEEN

≡≡≡ N<sup>os</sup> 1-6 ≡≡≡

---

N. V. SWETS & ZEITLINGER — Keizersgracht 471 — AMSTERDAM

# CONTENTS

## ARTICLES

	Page
E. BUYSSENS,	The Place of <i>Never</i> and <i>Ever</i> in Present-day English Prose 129
J. A. FALCONER,	The Letters of Walter Scott 49
W. VAN DER GAAF,	The Split Infinitive in Middle English 15
	The Evolution of nasal <i>a</i> in Anglo-Norman and in English 161 <sup>1</sup>
M. PRAZ,	Restoration Drama 1
J. VACHEK,	What is Phonology? 81
F. T. WOOD,	<i>The Merchant of Venice</i> in the Eighteenth Century 209

## REVIEWS<sup>2</sup>

Anwander, E.,	Pseudoklassizistisches und Romantisches in Thomson's <i>Seasons</i> (F. T. WOOD) 152
Babcock, R. W.,	The Genesis of Shakespeare Idolatry, 1766-1799 (F. T. WOOD) 71
Boas, F. S. & Serjeantson, M. S. (edd.),	The Year's Work in English Studies, VII-XII (R. W. ZANDVOORT) 177
Brinkley, R. F.,	Arthurian Legend in the Seventeenth Century (A. G. VAN KRANENDONK) 69
Brockington, A.,	Robert Browning and the Twentieth Century (P. DE REUL) 111
Cassirer, E.,	Die Platonische Renaissance in England und die Schule von Cambridge (M. PRAZ) 228
Chambers, E. K.,	William Shakespeare (J. KOOISTRA) 32
Dannenberg, F.,	Das Erbe Platons in England bis zur Bildung Lylys (M. PRAZ) 228
Decroos, J. (tr.),	Shakespeare's Sonnetten (A. VERWEY) 189
Deutschbein, M.,	Neuenglische Stilistik (C. VAN SPAENDONCK) 113
Doran, M.,	The Text of King Lear (B. A. P. VAN DAM) 99
Dörken, H.,	Lord Byrons Subjektivismus (F. T. WOOD) 155
Gardiner, A. H.,	The Theory of Speech and Language (H. J. Pos) 220
Gerould, G. H.,	The Ballad of Tradition (F. T. WOOD) 107
Glunz, H.,	Die Verwendung des Konjunktivs im Altenglischen (W. VAN DER GAAF) 222

<sup>1</sup> See also p. 220.

<sup>2</sup> Titles are preceded by the author's name, and followed by that of the reviewer.



	Page
Göwer, J. E. B., Mawer, A., & Stenton, F. M., Greenlaw, E.,	The Place-Names of Devon (J. MANSION) 184 Studies in Spenser's Historical Allegory (A. G. VAN KRANENDONK) 69
Grierson, H. J. C. (ed.),	The Letters of Sir Walter Scott 1815-1817 (J. A. FALCONER) 233
Harpsfield, N.,	The Life and Death of Sr. Thomas Moore (W. A. G. DOYLE-DAVIDSON) 28
Häusermann, H. W.,	Studien zu den Aktionsarten im Frühmittel- englischen (W. VAN DER GAAP) 65
Holthausen, F.,	Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (F. MOSSÉ) 60
Hoops, J.,	Beowulfstudien (K. MALONE) 94 Kommentar zum Beowulf (K. MALONE) 149
Humbert, G.,	Literarische Einflüsse in Schottischen Volks- balladen (F. T. WOOD) 107
Jones D.,	An Outline of English Phonetics, 3rd ed. (L. J. GUITTART) 45
Jordans, W.,	Der Germanische Volksglaube von den Toten und Dämonen im Berg (A. G. VAN HAMEL) 96
Karpf, F.,	Studien zur Syntax in den Werken Geoffrey Chaucers (W. VAN DER GAAP) 38
Koch, J. (ed.),	Geoffrey Chaucers Kleinere Dichtungen (M. S. SERJEANTSON) 97
Macmichael, W., Millican, C. B.,	The Gold-Headed Cane (B. A. P. VAN DAM) 230 Spenser and the Table Round (A. G. VAN KRANENDONK) 69
Onions, C. T. (ed.),	The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary (F. MOSSÉ & R. W. ZANDVOORT) 119
Overman, A. A.,	An Investigation into the Character of Fanny Burney (F. T. WOOD) 200
Papenheim, W.,	Die Charakterschilderungen im <i>Tatler</i> , <i>Spectator</i> , und <i>Guardian</i> (F. T. WOOD) 198
Roeckerath, N.,	Der Nachruhm Herricks und Wallers (F. T. WOOD) 197
Rosenblatt, L.,	L'Idée de l'Art pour l'Art dans la Littérature Anglaise pendant la Période Victorienne (P. DE REUL) 74
Rotter, A.,	Der Arbeiterroman in England seit 1880 (W. VAN MAANEN) 202
———,	Frank Swinnerton und George Gissing (W. VAN MAANEN) 202
Schleich, G. (ed.),	<i>Sire Degarre</i> (M. S. SERJEANTSON) 67 <i>Guy of Warwick</i> (M. S. SERJEANTSON) 67
Serjeantson, M. S. (ed.),	Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature, VII-XII (R. W. ZANDVOORT) 177

Stern, G.,	Meaning and Change of Meaning (C. VAN SPAENDONCK)	21
Thornbury, M.,	Henry Fielding's Theory of the Comic Prose Epic (F. P. VAN DER VOORDE)	154
Weber, A.,	George Gissing und die soziale Frage (W. VAN MAANEN)	202
White, B. (ed.),	The <i>Vulgaria</i> of John Stanbridge and the <i>Vulgaria</i> of Robert Whittinton (P. MEISSNER)	98
Widmann, W.,	Hamlets Bühnenlaufbahn, 1601-1877 (H. DE GROOT)	193
Willinsky, M.,	Bischof Percy's Bearbeitung der Volksballaden und Kunstgedichte seines Folio-Manuskriptes (F. T. WOOD)	107
Wilson Knight, G.,	The Wheel of Fire The Imperial Theme The Shakespearean Tempest	(M. PRAZ) 186
Wolff, E. (ed.),	England und die Antike (P. MEISSNER)	
Wood, F. T.,	An Anthology of Augustan Poetry (J. A. FALCONER)	105
Wyld, H. C.,	The Universal English Dictionary (O. JESPERSEN)	43

## MISCELLANEOUS

### Notes and News.

J. B. van Amerongen, The Malvern Festival, 92; G. Scheurweghs, The Date of *The History of Jacob and Esau*, 218.

Examen Engels M.O. B. 1932, 21; A-Examen 1932, 59; Holiday Courses, 60; Summer Meetings and Festivals, 93; B-Examen 1932, 93; Professor A. G. van Kranendonk, 176; Misprints in the Tauchnitz Edition, 176; Corrigendum, 220.

Brief Mention 48, 123, 156, 234

Bibliography 77, 124, 157, 205, 235



## Restoration Drama.

Among the advantages of centenary celebrations I would not hesitate to reckon the opportunity of taking stock of the available editions of an author. When asked in Florence, in the summer of 1931, to write a popular article for an Italian review about Dryden, whose centenary was then recurring, I vainly searched all the public libraries of that town for at least some of Dryden's plays: while his poetical works were not uncommon — they were, in fact, read and imitated in eighteenth century Italy — his dramas, even the one which is reputed his masterpiece, *All for Love*, were entirely beyond reach. This gap — which I am sure Florence shared with many other continental towns, (and, I am afraid, also with some English ones) — seems even more difficult to account for after reading Dryden's theatre in the typographically magnificent text edited by Montague Summers for the Nonesuch Press.<sup>1</sup> One is left to wonder at the contrast between the short-lived popularity of Dryden's heroic dramas, and the unfailing success enjoyed by Metastasio's theatre which they foreshadowed to some extent. True, Metastasio's celebrity was mainly achieved through tuneful airs and graceful metres, his operas had all the lightsome qualities of the Rococo, whereas some Spanish baroque heaviness mixed with classical French formality seems to hang about Dryden's scenes; but, here as well as there, we are confronted with similar developments of the same tradition. In his introduction to *The Conquest of Granada* Dryden quotes the opening lines of Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*:

Le donne, i cavalier, l'arme, gli amori,  
Le cortesie, l'audaci imprese io canto,

and adds that "an Heroick Play ought to be an imitation, in little, of an Heroick Poem"; Tasso, however, more than Ariosto, supplied him with a model for his heroes, as Prof. Roswell Gray Ham has well noticed in his study on *Otway and Lee*<sup>2</sup>: "The Rinaldo of Tasso was more surely the prototype of Almanzor than the Achilles of Homer, or, less certainly, the Artéban of La Calprenède. Though Dryden professed to admire the Grecian demigod beyond the ruffled French hero, it was nevertheless the chop-logic of the latter and the unparalleled magnanimity of the noble Rinaldo that together composed the *mélange* which was Almanzor." (pp. 39-40). And, more generally (p. 34): "The heroic lovers of Dryden had cast away discretion, and, in their striving to achieve in tragedy the effects of Rinaldo in epic poetry, had merely risen to the realm of the baroque." It seems indeed needless to trace the impression of Tassese atmosphere to single scenes of Dryden's (as for instance the Enchanted Wood in *King Arthur*), so closely his sensibility seems to be related, at times, to that of the author of the *Gerusalemme*. No more apposite

<sup>1</sup> DRYDEN. *The Dramatic Works*. Edited by Montague Summers, For the Nonesuch Press, London, 1931—32. Six volumes £ 7 17s. 6d. a set (the edition being limited to 750 standard sets numbered 51 to 800 and 50 special sets on Van Gelder paper, quarter bound, numbered 1 to 50). Vol. I, pp. cxxxvi—460; vol. II, pp. 532; vol. III, pp. 595; vol. IV, pp. 603; vol. V, pp. 545; vol. VI, pp. 594.

<sup>2</sup> *Otway and Lee*, Biography from a Baroque Age. New Haven, Yale University Press, London, Milford, 1931, pp. xiv—250, five plates, 17s. net.



emblem could be imagined of the kind of heroic infatuation which reached its climax in England with Dryden, and in the South with Metastasio's operas, than the figure of Tasso's woman-warrior, soft-breasted beneath a glittering armour. There is more effeminacy in Metastasio, more Spanish casuistry in Dryden, but their mellow colours, their words "not forc'd but sliding into rhyme", seem to reflect different stages of the same taste, a taste which finds expression also in Tiepolo's paintings :

She lay, and leant her cheek upon her hand,  
And cast a look so languishingly sweet  
As if, secure of all beholders hearts,  
Neglecting, she could take 'em : Boys, like *Cupids*,  
Stood fanning with their painted wings, the winds  
That plaid about her face: but if she smil'd,  
A darting glory seem'd to blaze abroad:  
That mens desiring eyes were never weary'd;  
But hung upon the object: to soft Flutes  
The Silver Oars kept time: and while they plaid,  
The hearing gave new pleasure to the sight;  
And both to thought: 'twas Heaven, or somewhat more;  
For she so charm'd all hearts, that gazing crowds  
Stood panting on the shore, and wanted breath  
To give their welcome voice.....

Many traits of this description (*All for Love*, Act III) are to be found in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* (Act II, sc. 2), but the whole effect differs as that of a fresco from that of an oil-painting or a miniature. Shakespeare, Renaissance-wise, dwells curiously upon all the details of the scene ; his fastidious strokes are hardly to be compared to the sweep of Dryden's brush: even when they appear to paint the same object, the difference of technique alters the whole impression :

On each side her  
Stood pretty-dimpled boys, like smiling Cupids,  
With divers colour'd fans, whose wind did seem  
To glow the delicate cheeks which they did cool  
.....  
Her gentlewomen, like the Nereides,  
So many mermaids, tended her i' the eyes,  
And made their bends adornings; at the helm  
A seeming mermaid steers; the silken tackle  
Swell with the touches of those flower-soft hands,  
That yarely frame the office.....  
.....The city cast  
Her people out upon her .....

Shakespeare's picture is not focussed into a single vista, whereas in Dryden's fresco we see the darting glory of Cleopatra's smile blazing abroad from the very centre, and gazing crowds massed on the margins of the scene, in the way Tiepolo's onlookers, in the shadow, people the edge of a ceiling whose centre is "Heaven or somewhat more". Such art of foreshortening is not of Shakespeare's time; but Metastasio knew it, and Dryden knew it before him. Dryden's dramas must be judged in connexion with this scenographical outlook; for, certainly, if we inspect them, so far as plots and characters are concerned (I am not speaking here of the quality of the verse), inch by inch like pieces of minute workmanship, we cannot avoid dissatisfaction. Contrasts of souls and impulses are arranged according to an external rhythm, the rhythm of



a ballet or a figure-dance, rather than left to the free arrangement of a natural development. Dryden's psychology, like Metastasio's, may seem as mechanical as clock-work, if we take it to be the central feature of the drama, which indeed it is not.

Our quarrels kinder, then our friendships prove:  
You for my Countrey Fight, I for your Love.  
(*The Indian Queen*, I, 1)

It was my Honor made my Duty erre.  
(*id.*, III, 1)

Now take your choice, and bid him live or die;  
To both shew Pity, or shew Cruelty:  
'Tis you that must condemn, I'll only act;  
Your Sentence is more cruel than my Fact.  
(*id.*, IV, 1)

..... It is some joy to see  
That my Revenge will prove my Piety.  
(*id.*)

And I will prove —  
Those joys in vengeance, which I want in Love.  
(*id.*)

Fantastick Honour, thou hast fram'd a Toyl  
Thy self, to make thy Love thy Vertues Spoil.  
(*The Indian Emperour*, IV, 2)

Here Constancy; Ambition there does move;  
On each side Beauty, and on both sides Love.  
(*Secret Love*, IV, 2)

Honour and Faith let Argument debate.  
(*Tyrannick Love*, IV, 1)

Betwixt my love and vertue I am tost.  
(*The Conquest of Granada*, II)

The daughter of the onely man I hate!  
Two Contradictions twisted in a fate!  
(*id.*, V)

My duty to my life I will prefer;  
But life and duty must give place to her.  
(*The Conquest of Granada*, Second Part, IV)

Duty and Love, by turns possess my soul,  
And struggle for a fatal victory.....  
(*Marriage a-la-Mode*, V, 1)

Oh! *Indamora*, hide these fatal Eyes;  
Too deep they wound whom they too soon surprise:  
My Virtue, Prudence, Honour, Interest, all  
Before this Universal Monarch fall.

(*Aureng-Zebe*, II)  
— How cou'd my Hand rebell against my Heart?  
— How cou'd your Heart rebell against your Reason?  
(*The Spanish Fryar*, IV)

Tu vendetta mi chiedi;  
Tito vuol fedeltà. Tu di tua mano  
Con l'offerta mi sproni; ei mi raffrena  
Co' benefizi suoi. Per te l'amore,  
Per lui parla il dover. Se a te ritorno,  
Sempre ti trovo in volto  
Qualche nuova beltà; se torno a lui,  
Sempre gli scopro in seno  
Qualche nuova virtù. Vorrei servirti;  
Tradirlo non vorrei. Viver non posso,  
Se ti perdo, mia vita; e se t'acquisto,  
Vengo in odio a me stesso.....

(Metastasio, *La Clemenza di Tito*, I, 1)

Such contrasts of personified passions — as if the characters were playing at a game of cards named after the contents of the human soul — had been rendered familiar by both the Spanish and the French stage, and can be traced ultimately to scholastic psychology and Senecan drama. That such cut and dry abstractions, falling easily into the pattern of the then fashionable epigram, could achieve effects not unlike those of the stichomythia of Greek tragedies, the reader needs hardly to be reminded by an instance like the following (*The Indian Emperour*, II, 2):

- Alibech.* He who his Prince so blindly does obey,  
To keep his Faith his Vertue throws away.  
*Cortez.* Monarchs may err, but should each private breast  
Judge their ill Acts, they would dispute their best.  
*Cydaria.* Then all your care is for your Prince I see,  
Your truth to him out-weighs your love to me;  
You may so cruel to deny me prove,  
But never after that, pretend to love.  
*Cortez.* Command my Life, and I will soon obey,  
To save my Honour I my Blood will pay; etc.

I repeat, it would be unfair to judge Dryden, no less than Metastasio, from the impression such ready-made, facile psychology is likely to create. Do we seek in a fresco more than the glow of a general effect, and the art of grouping the lights and shadows? Shakespeare's dramas, like life itself, may leave us perplexed as to a world of possible implications; there is no ambiguity of purpose in Dryden's; the subject of his frescoes is, as a rule, the apotheosis of romantic Love. This is nowhere so evident as in *All for Love*:

See *Europe, Africk, Asia*, put in ballance,  
And all weigh'd down by one light worthless Woman! —

but everywhere in Dryden's heroic dramas we see empires overthrown, situations reversed, wise men rave, true warriors betray, all because of love, "the Hurrican of life" (*Conq. Granada*, V). *Amore alma è del mondo*, Tasso had sung in a famous sonnet; for him to be vanquished Dryden conjured up the stately allegories of the French stage, Virtue, Honour, Renown, like so many symbols of Ripa's *Iconologia*<sup>1</sup>, and disposed them in various attitudes of dismay, fear, surrender, at the feet of the triumphant Monarch of the soul.

Let us add at once that, whereas Love of Tasso's sonnet was platonic love in the sense of the Renaissance, and the language of Dryden's heroic dramas seems to countenance Montague Summers's opinion (Vol. I, p. xlv):

The sentimental Platonism, highly metaphysical, but perhaps not so unreal as some have supposed, which informs his heroic tragedies, and traces of which are by no means absent from others of his plays, came to him mainly through the romances of La Calprenède and Mlle de Scudéry, who themselves most directly derived this philosophy of love from D'Urfé —

the kind of love hinted at in the hazy metaphors of the heroic language had nothing much platonic about it. The passion of Racine's *Phèdre* glimmers every

<sup>1</sup> There is a close correspondence between the formal psychology of the drama, and the allegorical painting of the period. For this latter see for instance E. Mâle, *L'Art religieux après le Concile de Trente*, Etude sur l'Iconographie de la Fin du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle, du XVII<sup>e</sup>, du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle, Paris, Colin, 1932, Ch. IX, *L'Allégorie*.



now and then in those dramas<sup>1</sup>; a night of love is the ultimate end of the lovers. They bring to this single purpose almost the ecstatic intensity which we usually connect with the lovers of the Romantic period. Take for instance the words of Don Sebastian to the Emperor who has asked: "Thou art not marry'd to *Almeyda*?"

Seb. Yes.  
 Emp. And own'st the usurpation of my Love?  
 Seb. I own it in the face of Heav'n and thee,  
 No Usurpation, but a lawful claim,  
 Of which I stand possesst.  
 .....  
 Were I to choose again, and knew my fate,  
 For such a night I wou'd be what I am.  
 The Joys I have possesst are ever mine;  
 Out of thy reach beyond Eternity,  
 Hid in the sacred treasure of the past;  
 But blest remembrance brings 'em hourly back.  
 Emp. Hourly indeed, who hast but hours to live;  
 O mighty purchase of a boastèd bliss!  
 To dream of what thou hadst one fugitive night,  
 And never shalt have more.  
 Almeyda. How can we better dye than close embrac'd,  
 Sucking each others Souls while we expire? etc.

Tasso's episode of Olindo and Sofronia may be quoted here; but the romantic idea of the incomparable bliss of the fruition of Love is the same in Dryden as — *si parva licet* — in J. E. Flecker's *Hassan*. The idea is voiced again through Adrastus's lips (in *CEdipus*, Act III, written by Dryden):

Give me a night with her,  
 And I'll give all the rest.

All for love, all for a night of love. I am glad such hints in the tragedies allow us to acquit Dryden of the blame of hypocrisy: for how could we otherwise reconcile with the idea of a Platonist the author of *Marriage a-la-Mode* and the other comedies? True, Renaissance sonneteers saw no contradiction between their chaste sonnets and their priapic verse, not to say their frequently unchaste lives, and Dryden could not be seriously taken to task on this account. Still, it would require an unnatural strain to envisage an audience delighting both in pure Platonism — a thing apart from metaphysical language and courtly expressions — and in the unmitigated coarseness of Restoration comedy, which faithfully mirrored the manners of the age. The only distinction was a distinction of *genres* and of language suited to each; and Dryden was very strict on this point. "An Heroick Play ought to be an imitation, in little of an Heroick Poem: and consequently, Love and Valour ought to be the subject of it." (*Of Heroique Plays*, an essay prefixed to *The Conquest of Granada*). Hence the stilted feelings ascribed to the characters, their absurd striving to outdo each other in generosity, the intrusion of long similes, after the model of Homer, into dramatic passages, as for instance:

<sup>1</sup> Phèdre is actually the model of Cassandra in *Cleomenes* (chiefly Act IV), of Queen Deidamia in Otway's feeble *Alcibiades* (Act II, 144 ff.), and in general of the stock character of the lustful queen.

Dear Child make haste ;  
 All hope of succour, but from thee is past :  
 As on the sand the frighted Traveller  
 Sees the high Sea come rolling from a far,  
 The Land grow short, he mends his weary pace,  
 While Death behind him covers all the place :  
 So I swift mis-fortunes am pursu'd,<sup>1</sup>  
 Which on each other, are like Waves renew'd —  
 (The Indian Emperour, IV, 2)

and the choice of splendid similes, suited to the noble style :

Oh ! had he still that character maintain'd,  
 Of Valour, which in blooming Youth he gain'd !  
 He promis'd in his East a glorious Race ;  
 Now sunk from his Meridian, sets apace.  
 But as the Sun, when he from Noon declines,  
 And with abated heat, less fiercely shines,  
 Seems to grow milder as he goes away,  
 Pleasing himself with the remains of Day :  
 So he who, in his Youth, for Glory strove,  
 Would recompence his Age with Ease and Love —  
 (Aureng-Zebe, I)

the deliberate "roughness of the numbers and cadences" in *Don Sebastian*, "a more noble daring in the Figures, and more suitable to the loftiness of the Subject"; in short, such preoccupations of etiquette, as the poetics of the period dictated, and the influence of the Court, under whose shadow literary activity still took place, must have encouraged. "And this leads me to the last and greatest advantage of our writing, which proceeds from conversation. In the Age, wherein those Poets liv'd, there was less of gallantry than in ours: neither did they keep the best company of theirs..... Now, if any ask me, whence it is that our conversation is so much refin'd ? I must freely, and without flattery, ascribe it to the Court: and, in it, particularly to the King; whose example gives a law to it." (*Defence of the Epilogue to the Second Part of Granada*). It is curious to notice how the influence of the Court on the one hand led Dryden to give a more refined version of *Troilus and Cressida* ("I undertook to remove that heap of Rubbish, under which many excellent thoughts lay wholly bury'd": *Preface to the Play*); on the other was obviously responsible for the employment of the no less coarse — but fashionable — expressions displayed in the comedies. The taste of the court and the King must have favoured such similes derived from prostitution as are frequently found in the prologues and epilogues, the brothel and *ballum rancum* scenes in the plays themselves, the persistent railing at married life, the monotonous pillorying of cuckoldom, the *double entendres*, the Boccaccian situations, and peculiarities more typical of the period. First of all, an almost indispensable feature of the comedies, to account for which the influence of the Spanish stage and the example of the Jacobean and Caroline theatre are hardly sufficient, seems to have been the disguising of women in man's dress, a source of lascivious ambiguities. See for instance the scene between Palamede and Doralice in man's habit in *Marriage a-la-Mode*, Act IV, sc. 3 :

<sup>1</sup> Sic. A "by" after "I" must have dropped from Montague Summers's text, which I am unable to collate.



*Pala.* I find now, thou art a Boy of more understanding than I thought thee; a very lewd wicked Boy: o' my conscience thou would'st debauch me, and hast some evil designs upon my person.

Such artificialities lend themselves to graceful rococo effects, as in *The Rival Ladies*, IV, 3:

*Man.* The Pretty Boys that serv'd *Gonsalvo*, Fighting!  
I come in time to save the Life of one.

.....

What is it, gentle Youths that moves you thus?

.....

You seem the little *Cupids* in the Song,  
Contending for the Honey-bagg.

The witty libertinism of the French eighteenth century seems already present in certain passages of Restoration comedies, as in the amusing pornographical song in the second scene of Act IV of *Marriage a-la-Mode*:

The youth, though in haste,  
And breathing his last,  
In pity dy'd slowly, while she dy'd more fast;  
Till at length she cry'd, Now, my dear, now let us go,  
Now die, my *Alexis*, and I will die too.

Another aspect of Restoration libertinism as reflected on the stage has been noticed by Prof. Roswell Gray Ham<sup>1</sup> apropos of Lee's and Dryden's *Cædipus*:

In the more startling insertion of a love motif into the major plot of *Cædipus* and *Jocasta*, the collaborators were less squeamish than the Greek or the French authors. A certain perversion of national taste — clearly recognizable from Elizabethan times — delighted in all sorts of unnatural relations. Such was the passion of Polydore for Monimia in *The Orphan*, and the endless father-and-son or brother-and-brother rivalries of *Don Carlos*, *Mithridates*, and *Caesar Borgia*. Nowhere does this habit of mind become so repulsive, however, as in the incestuous plot of *Cædipus*. Where the Greek had dismissed the guiltless-guilty characters with the curse of destiny upon them, and had provoked *Jocasta* to suicide from the fatal revelation, Lee and Dryden were inclined to palliate the crime to the extent of a recall for one final scene of mad love. The English dramatists made much of the fact that *Jocasta* would have buried the secret, and that *Cædipus* himself, enslaved by the love god, trembled upon the brink of compromise.

The incest theme which Ford had treated apologetically in his famous tragedy, is again romantically envisaged in the last scene of *Don Sebastian*:

*Seb.* Speak'st thou of Love, of Fortune, or of Death,  
Or double Death, for we must part, *Almeyda*.

*Alm.* I speak of all.  
For all things that belong to us are cruell.  
But what's most cruell, we must love no more.  
O 'tis too much that I must never see you,  
But not to love you is impossible:  
No, I must love you Heav'n may bate me that  
And charge that Sinfull Sympathy of Souls  
Upon our Parents, when they lov'd too well.

*Seb.* Good Heav'n, thou speak'st my thoughts, and I speak thine.  
Nay then there's Incest in our very Souls.  
For we were form'd too like.

.....

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 160.

- Alm.* I wou'd have ask'd you, if I durst for shame,  
If still you lov'd? you gave it Air before me.  
Ah why were we not born both of a Sex;  
For then we might have lov'd, without a Crime!  
Why was not I your Brother? though that wish  
Involv'd our Parents guilt, we had not parted;  
We had been Friends, and Friendship is not Incest.
- Seb.* Alas, I know not by what name to call thee!  
Sister and Wife are the two dearest Names;  
And I wou'd call thee both; and both are Sin.  
Unhappy we! that still we must confound  
The dearest Names into a common Curse.
- Alm.* To love, and be belov'd, and yet be wretched!
- Seb.* To have but one poor night of all our lives;  
It was indeed a glorious, guilty night:  
So happy, that, forgive me Heav'n, I wish  
With all its guilt, it were to come again.

Or take Act III, sc. 1, of *Love Triumphant* :

- Victoria.* I Love my Brother, and avow that Fire:  
His Love to me has rais'd his Noble Thoughts  
To Brave Atchievements, for your Crown and you.  
For Love's the Steel, that strikes upon the Flint:  
Gives Coldness Heat, exerts the hidden Flame;  
And spreads the Sparkles round, to warm the World.
- Veramond.* Oh Heav'n's, she makes a Merit of her Crime.

How far such treatment of the incest theme may have answered a positive taste of the Court, may be easily inferred from what is known about its moral standards. On the other hand, it was the King himself who suggested the notorious Nicky Nacky scenes, with their ribald satire upon Shaftesbury, in *Venice Preserved*<sup>1</sup>: a companion to that scene is to be found in Shadwell's *Virtuoso*. Political satire goes only half way to explain the representation of vice on the stage; a mixture of exhibitionism and *voyeur's* indulgence must be supposed at the back of the delight Restoration society took in seeing its own manners reproduced on the stage or held up to derision in the satires. Authors of these latter, it should be remembered, were first of all the rakes themselves<sup>2</sup>. Decadence is a big word, apt to cause misconceptions chiefly when used in connection with literature, but the literature which flourished at the Court of the last Stuarts seems to me clearly to bear the marks of a decadent spirit. Otway's theatre, which is available now in J. C. Ghosh's excellent edition<sup>3</sup>, shows, together with a predilection for a rehash of Elizabethan horrors (shared by Nathaniel Lee), an indulgence in the noble pleasure of tears and a general effeminacy which, at its best, achieves pictures of moving tenderness:

O thou art tender all!  
Gentle and kind, as sympathising Nature!  
When a sad story has been told, I've seen  
Thy little breasts with soft Compassion swell'd,  
Shove up and down, and heave like dying birds.

(*The Orphan*, Act. II, sc. 1)

<sup>1</sup> See *The Dramatic Censor* (1770), I, 313, and R. G. Ham, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

<sup>2</sup> See my remarks on Rochester in my previous article on *Poets and Wits of the Restoration in English Studies*, vol. X (1928), no. 2, pp. 41-53.

<sup>3</sup> *The Works of Thomas Otway*, Plays, Poems, and Love-Letters, Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1932, Two vols., 40s. net., Vol. I, pp. 520, Vol. II, pp. 542.



The central theme of Otway, which he attempted in *Don Carlos* and carried through successfully in *Venice Preserved*, is that of a man deliberately led to sacrifice by the woman he loves<sup>1</sup>. These are the words of Jaffeir to Belvidera (Act IV):

Come, lead me forward now like a tame Lamb  
To sacrifice: thus in his fatal Garlands,  
Deck'd fine and pleas'd, the wanton skips and plays,  
Trots by the enticing flattering Priestess side,  
And much transported with its little pride,  
Forgets its dear companions of the plain,  
Till by Her, bound, Hee's on the Altar layn;  
Yet then too hardly bleats, such pleasure's in the pain.<sup>2</sup>

It is a far cry from *Venice Preserved* to Swinburne's *Chastelard*, but in the extreme development of the Elizabethan stage represented by Otway and Lee we can already feel a foretaste of certain morbid aspects of Romanticism. Otway's pathos is, at times, that of a less saturnine, softer Webster:

When I'm laid low in the Grave, and quite forgotten,  
Maist thou be happy in a fairer Bride;  
But none can ever love thee like *Monimia*.  
When I am dead, as presently I shall be;  
(For the grim Tyrant grasps my heart already)  
Speak well of me and if thou find ill tongues  
Too busie with my fame, don't hear me wrong'd;  
'Twill be a noble Justice to the memory  
Of a poor wretch, once honour'd with thy Love.  
How my head swims! 'Tis very dark: Good-night.

(*The Orphan*, V, 1)

The last moments of Otway's heroes are, like those of Webster's, shrouded "in a mist"; they, too, go they "know not whither".

Now all I beg, is, lay me in one Grave,  
Thus with my Love. Farewel, I now am — nothing.  
(*id.*)

<sup>1</sup> A figure similar to Belvidera is that of La Marmoutier in *The Duke of Guise*.

<sup>2</sup> Jaffeir's words to Pierre are no less typical of effeminate dedication.

Act II, ll. 424 ff.:

Oh *Pierre*, wert thou but she,  
How I could pull thee down into my heart,  
Gaze on thee till my Eye-strings crackt with Love.  
Till all my sinews with its fire extended,  
Fixt me upon the Rack of ardent longing;  
Then swelling, sighing, raging to be blest,  
Come like a panting Turtle to thy Breast,  
On thy soft Bosom, hovering, bill and play,  
Confess the cause why last I fled away.....

Act IV, ll. 337 ff.:

No, thou shalt not force me from thee.  
Use me reproachfully, and like a slave  
Tread on me, buffet me, heap wrongs on wrongs  
On my poor head: I'll bear it all with patience,  
Shall weary out thy most unfriendly cruelty,  
Ly at thy feet and kiss 'em though they spurn me,  
Till, wounded by my sufferings, thou relent,  
And raise me to thy armes with dear forgiveness.

In their attempts at the terrific, both Otway and Lee remind us not so much of the Senecan horrors of the Elizabethan stage, as of the worst excesses of the *frénétique* Romantics, from Petrus Borel to Catulle Mendès: there is indeed a new tang in their sensibility which is absent from the crude Senecan pictures:

*Polydore.*

then thus let's go together

Full of our guilt, distracted where to roam,  
Like the first Wretched Pair expell'd their Paradise.  
Let's find some place where Adders nest in Winter,  
Loathsome and Venomous; Where poisons hang  
Like Gums against the Walls; Where Witches meet  
By night and feed upon some pamper'd Imp,  
Fat with the Blood of Babes: There we'll inhabit,  
And live up to the height of desperation.  
Desire shall languish like a withering Flower,  
And no distinction of the Sex be thought of.  
Horrors shall fright me from those pleasing harms,  
And I'll no more be caught with Beauties Charms,  
But when I'm dying take me in thy Arms.

This passage in *The Orphan* (Act IV, ll. 446 ff.) can be matched only in certain ranting passages of Mendès's *Zo'har*, where a similar incestuous passion is wrought up to a romantic pitch of pleasure-pain; and it is again in the hallucinations of the same French decadent novel that we may find a parallel for Œdipus's vision in the fifth act of Lee's and Dryden's play, or for the grotesque apparition of "the names of Œdipus and Jocasta written... in great Characters of Gold" in the sky in the second act of the same tragedy. Again, in *The Orphan*, the horrors of the romantic dungeons of Monk Lewis and Mrs. Radcliffe are anticipated in Monimia's words (Act IV, ll. 209 ff.):

When in some Cell distracted, as I shall be,  
Thou seest me ly; these unregarded Locks,  
Matted like Furies Tresses; my poor Limbs  
Chain'd to the Ground, and 'stead of the delights  
Which happy Lovers taste, my Keeper's stripes,  
A Bed of Straw, and a course wooden dish  
Of wretched sustenance; when thus thou see'st me,  
Prithee have Charity and pity for me.  
Let me enjoy this thought.

Like poets of the *Sturm und Drang*, Otway ended his years as a beggar, Lee as a lunatic: one feels almost tempted to rewrite the subtitle of Prof. Ham's book ("Biography from a Baroque Age") as "Biography from a Pre-romantic Age".

Far above the excesses now illustrated, Dryden too has, nevertheless, many a romantic hint. Whereas Shakespeare's Antony had said (Act II, sc. 5):

Give me some music ; music, moody food  
Of us that trade in Love..... —

Dryden develops the suggestion into a romantic *rêverie* (*All for Love*, Act I):

Give me some Musick ; look that it be sad ;  
I'll sooth my melancholy, till I swell  
And burst my self with sighing. —  
'Tis somewhat to my humor. Stay, I fancy  
I'm now turn'd wild, a Commoner of Nature ;  
Of all forsaken, and forsaking all :

[Soft Music]



Live in a shady Forrest's *Sylvan* scene,  
 Stretch'd at my length beneath some blasted Oke ;  
 I lean my head upon the Mossy Bark,  
 And look just of a piece, as I grew from it :  
 My uncomb'd Locks, matted like *Miseto*,  
 Hang o're my hoary Face ; a murm'ring Brook  
 Runs at my foot.

The image of "the melancholy Jaques" in Shakespeare's *As You Like It* (II, 1, 25-63) seems indeed to have been before Dryden's mind in this passage — as Montague Summers observes — but the romantic effect is much enhanced in Dryden. Even Shakespeare's "oak whose antique root, etc." becomes the "blasted oak" so dear to the Romantic discoverers of the Picturesque. The details of the sylvan scene are commonplace enough (also in Milton's *Penseroso* we find the "monumental Oake", the brook, the waters murmuring, the combined pleasures of Music and Melancholy), but Dryden's treatment testifies to the awakening of a new sensibility. I need not dwell on another romantic passage, the song in the third scene of Act IV of *The Indian Emperour*, which Tennyson imitated in his *Lotus-Eaters*; and perhaps it would be pressing the point to draw attention to the Indian Cave scene in *Tyrannick Love* (Act IV, sc. 1) as an anticipation of certain effects in Shelley's *Prometheus*.

Another romantic theme Dryden seems to foreshadow, together with that of the omnipotence of the love-passion, love as "Hurrican of Life", is that of the fatal woman: Lindaraxa, in whose hand "bloody hearts lie panting", to whose eyes "no Ornaments of pow'r so please" "as purple, which the blood of Princes, dies"; Cleopatra, who deserves "more Worlds" than Antony can lose (Cleopatra, destined to be for the Romantics the supreme incarnation of the fatal woman); Leonora (in *The Spanish Fryar*), of whom Torrismond says (Act III):

You are so beautifull,  
 So wondrous fair, you justifie Rebellion :  
 As if that faultless Face could make no Sin,  
 But Heaven, with looking on it, must forgive —

Cassandra (in *Cleomenes*, Act II), who, like one of the Oriental queens in Swinburne's *Masque of Queen Bersabe*, says :

I am the Goddess that commands the Seas.

Such romantic seeds, it may be maintained, were already extant in the Elizabethans; but it must be borne in mind that the Restoration writers were brought back to Shakespeare and the Elizabethans by a revulsion of fashion: they saw them through the magic medium of the intervening years. What they did on a reduced scale was to give the first sign of a tendency which reached its full momentum only a century later. "The dramatists of 1680, led by Otway, were rediscovering the undrained sources of inspiration that lay in Shakespeare." <sup>1</sup> Their attempts at imitating Shakespeare may appear to us often crude and puerile *pastiches*; but the fact remains that they envisaged Shakespeare's world from a distance, and distance, for them as well as for

<sup>1</sup> R. G. Ham, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

the Romantics, "lent enchantment to the view". Lee's Caesar Borgia is no longer the Caesar Borgia of the Elizabethans; he is already beginning to be the Renaissance tyrant of the Romantics. The mixed character of Restoration tragedies has been well defined by Prof. Ham <sup>1</sup>:

The architecture of these tragedies was of a characteristic bastard origin. Side by side with French and Italianate galleries in the full efflorescence of rococo adornment, are to be found ponderous outworks, or even whole stories, in the Tudor and Jacobean manner. The Poppea of Lee's *Nero* awhile strides unabashed as the familiar lustful queen of heroic tragedy, and then is metamorphosed into a pale Cressida with momentary pangs of conscience, only to die at length, a woman killed by kindness. Tissaphernes, of Otway's first play, plots death and destruction with all the tortuous convolutions of a villain of Settle or Dryden, and then shades off into an irrational Iago. His character develops by endless soliloquy, much of it copied from Shakespeare's villain, but subtly shifts from the Elizabethan themes of "will" and "reputation" to those upon the scale of the Restoration mind, "the futility of conscience" and "ambition".

When speaking of Shakespeare's influence on Restoration playwrights, we must however add at once a fundamental difference of attitude from the Romantics. For Dryden Shakespeare was Nature (see Prologue to the *Tempest*, or the *Enchanted Island*) but such Nature as could be improved by Art, according to Ben Jonson's well-known opinion.

Let us therefore admire the beauties and the heights of *Shakespeare*, without falling after him into a carelessness and (as I may call it) a Lethargy of thought for whole Scenes together.

(*Defence of the Epilogue to the Second Part of Granada*).

For the Romantics Shakespeare was Nature to be imitated *qua* such.

We may grant to Montague Summers that *All for Love* and *Troilus and Cressida* are better constructed plays than those of Shakespeare on which they are based, and we may consent with him in his praise of Dryden, although we feel that that praise often loses value by its indiscrimination and extravagance. Montague Summers has been among the first modern critics to feel again the charm of Dryden; now that admiration of Dryden is the vogue (see T. S. Eliot's *Homage to Dryden*, etc.), he tries to make his voice heard above a chorus by straining the note. Not only he lavishes hyperbolic eulogies on his idol, not only he lets his critical acumen be completely dazzled by what he calls Dryden's "undeviating excellence" ("Whatever I read of Dryden I am entirely satisfied. I cannot conceive that anything of his could be better done", vol. I, p. cxxix); but he must bring victims to the altar of his divinity, and if Shakespeare proves too big a bull to be dragged along, Marlowe and Milton are no mean cattle for a *suovetaurilia*. We read of Marlowe's "swelling rants" contrasted to Dryden's "ermined altiloquence" (vol. I, p. xlix), and, apropos of the curious rococo *State of Innocence*, Milton is caused to fall on his knees by the triumphant assertion that *Paradise Lost* "is largely a paraphrase, philosophically distorted but often literally verbal, from the Italian" of Serafino della Salandra's *Adamo Caduto*, a hoax Montague Summers has swallowed whole from Norman Douglas's *Old Calabria*.<sup>2</sup> This uncritical

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 43.

<sup>2</sup> Norman Douglas's argument does not bear a moment's scrutiny. To use Montague Summers's words on another occasion (Vol. III, p. 250): "This is one of those needless seekings after similarities which disgust by their ineptitude rather than inform by their felicity." Douglas, in his turn, is indebted for the suggestion to Francesco Zicari's *Sulla scoperta dell' originale italiano da cui Milton trasse il suo poema del "Paradiso Perduto"*, in *Album scientifico-letterario*, Naples 1845 (see *Old Calabria*, ch. XXI.)



attitude may perhaps be found unworthy of a scholar, and such a scholar as Montague Summers claims to be, an actual *malleus hereticorum*, ready to fall on pigmy Saintsbury with all the weight of his accumulated learning. That Montague Summers's learning is vast, as well as varied and quaint, nobody would dispute who has taken the trouble to read his notes to Dryden's dramas. One may learn there the full particulars of such out of the way subjects as praetorian bands, Guelphs and Ghibellins, King Midas's ears, Nessus's shirt, Hercules and Omphale, the Sybil's leaves, the harmony of the spheres, Capaneus, Cato's *Delenda est Carthago*, Meleager's firebrand, Pallas's birth from the head of Zeus, the Sphinx, Ixion, Pegasus, Bellerophon. I imagine Montague Summers greatly underrates the standard of the average reader of his *Dryden*; he is just the opposite of Robert Browning who never bothered to explain the most recondite allusions of his poems, and wondered how anybody could ever have ignored the allusion contained in the title of *Bells and Pomegranates*. I for myself am at a loss how to imagine anybody wanting to read Dryden's plays who is not familiar with the most trivial elements of culture, or who needs to have hammered over and over again into his head the meaning of such expressions as: *possets*, *Hans in Kelder*, *glass coaches*, *ombre*; or to be told several times the legend about the murderer's presence causing the body of the victim to bleed, the other one on the jelly deposited by fallen stars; or the details of the *Furcae Caudinae*, of the story of Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay, etc..... Perhaps Montague Summers experiences a private delight in listening to his own voice; for does the reader really feel urged to become acquainted with all the particulars of the dedication of the *Aeneid* at the bare mention of Virgil, or with those of the composition and publication of Sidney's *Arcadia* at the mention of Damaetas, or with the complete story of the development of the *commedia dell'arte* at the mention of Ponchinello, or with the list of all the brazen tombs of Westminster because they are alluded to in general, or with the full account of the lives and works of all the Italian writers of *Poetics* because of an allusion to the Italian commentators of Aristotle? Do not such volumes as Encyclopaedias exist for references about Albornoz, Maximin, Bajazet, Heliodore's *Aethiopics*, Camoens, and so on? One cannot have enough of a good thing, and the pages of the Nonesuch Press *Dryden* are so neatly printed that one may wish for more of them to delight our eyes; still, one would like them to be full of more useful information than the superfluous notes of Montague Summers. Unfortunately, the reader may seek in vain for a satisfactory explanation of less obvious allusions. For instance, the passage (vol. III, p. 173) on "the Treatise of the Corruption of the Italian tongue" by "a famous Italian" elicits a long note from Montague Summers's industry, but though the reader may profit by it in other ways, he is left in the dark about the actual identity of the author of that treatise, supposing he can be identified, as I have been unable to do.<sup>1</sup> In a few cases, Montague Summers's information is out of date, as for instance when he ascribes to Raphael the fresco in the Cenacolo of Sant' Onofrio in Florence (vol. III, p. 566), long since recognised as the work of the school of Perugino, perhaps of Perugino himself (see Venturi, *Storia dell' Arte Italiana*, Vol. VII, Part 2, pp. 510-11). Elsewhere, unimportant analogues are quoted instead of a source, as the quotation of William Gurnall's late treatise (1652) apropos

<sup>1</sup> The likeliest among the authors quoted by Montague Summers is the Padre Sforza Pallavicino, *Trattato dello Stile e del Dialogo*.

of the nicety of the ermine which "will not bear a soil". In other cases, the editor has failed to draw attention to parallels apt to throw light on certain expressions. The "purple Panacea" of *The Tempest*, Act V (Vol. II, p. 221) derives from *Aeneis*, XII, 412 ff. (cf. *Gerusalemme Liberata*, XI, stanza 72 ff.): *dictamnū . . . . . flore comantem purpureo*, etc. Therefore Montague Summers's reference to Phillips and Bradley is irrelevant, and his explanation of Purple as "*Purpureus*, brilliant, beautiful, it may even mean 'shining white'" utterly impertinent. The reader of Act II, sc. 3, of *The Assignment* may wonder whether by the expression "your hand feels white" Dryden was anticipating later experiences of transference of perception (Vol. III, p. 294). But Act I of *Don Sebastian* offers a clue (Vol. VI, p. 36):

Blind Men say white feels smooth, and black feels rough.

This may seem trivial enough to Montague Summers; to me it seems less trivial than information on Hercules or Minerva.

I am afraid I am unable to defend Montague Summers — if such a defence is possible — against the strictures of the critic of the *Times Literary Supplement* (of February 4th, 1932; see also the following issues). I am no authority on the text of Dryden's plays, and what an accurate editor, Mr. J. C. Ghosh, has to say about Montague Summers's Nonesuch Press text of Otway<sup>1</sup> rather confirms the indictment of the *Times Literary Supplement*. In the course of my reading, I happened to notice a few misprints which I consign to a footnote<sup>2</sup>.

Florence-Manchester.

MARIO PRAZ.

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit., Vol. I, p. 86 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. I, p. 86, l. 1, *mieking*, read *micking*; p. 144, l. 12, *silence*, read *silent*; p. 372, l. 7 from bottom, 1638 should be 1658; p. 384, l. 4 from bottom, 1576 should be 1570; Vol. II, p. 30, l. 15, Hot Irons *thank 'em* for 't. q. think?; p. 184, l. 5, *Dordina*, read *Dorinda*; p. 353, l. 20 from bottom. *any*, wrongly repeated twice (the same be said for *more* in Vol. III, p. 68, l. 3); Vol. III, p. 277, l. 21 from bottom, *Stutdy*, read *Study*; p. 347, l. 14, *finè*, read *fini* (I omit a list of wrong or missing accents in both French and Italian quotations, both in Dryden's and in Montague Summers's passages; I may note here incidentally that the *novella* of the *Hecatommithi* quoted by Montague Summers on p. 346 as a possible source of the rape of Ysabinda in *Amboyna* has little relation to it. Cinthio's is a specific case of criminal lust, whereas the rape committed in *Amboyna* is of the most general description. Should we treat all the irrelevant matter in Montague Summers's edition with the severity he displays against other critics, we ought to apply to him what he says at p. 75 of Vol. IV, last three lines); Vol. IV, p. 303, l. 6 from bottom (and corresponding note on p. 548), *Sa, fa*, read *Sa, sa* (the *f* being a corruption of a long *s*); Vol. V, p. 82, l. 3 from bottom, *fom*, read *from*; p. 496, l. 13 from bottom, *brerla*, read *burla*; Vol. VI, p. 428, l. 19, *Fatigues*, read *q. Fatigue*. The division into lines and the scansion are faulty on p. 172 (ll. 14-15), pp. 201-2, 218 (ll. 4-5), 220 (last seven lines) of Vol. II; pp. 392-3 (Act V, sc. 1) of Vol. III; p. 410 (ll. 2-3) of Vol. IV. I do not expect this list to be by any means complete. In Mr. Ghosh's edition of Otway, Vol. II, p. 245, l. 16, *Procuralle* is obviously meant for *Procuratie*. As Mr. Ghosh is as sparing in his notes as Montague Summers is diffuse, I am unable to ascertain whether the error is definitely to be ascribed to Otway, or to the old printers: very likely to the former, as otherwise the line would not scan. Was the error already in Saint-Réal?



## The Split Infinitive in Middle English.

Although the much-maligned split infinitive made its appearance in English as long as seven centuries ago, it led a precarious existence until comparatively recent times. In Middle English the construction only occurs sporadically; in most texts there are no instances of it. Pecoock is the only early writer who shows a marked predilection for the split infinitive; I have noted upwards of 120 examples in his works.

If the Middle English examples are classified according to the nature of the word or word group that brings about the 'split', it turns out that there is not a single present day variety of the construction to which there is not a parallel in writings anterior to 1500. In more than one respect Middle English even went a step further than the most audacious splitter would dare to go at the present time. The negation *not*, for instance, is not infrequently found between *for* to and the infinitive.

Wyclif, *Matt.* v. 34, Forsothe Y say to 3ou, to nat swere on al manere.  
Id., *Ibid.* v. 39, But Y say to 3ou, to nat azein stonde yuel.

Wyclif-Purvey, *Rom.* xiv. 21, It is good to not ete fleisch, and to not drynke wyn.

Id., 2 *Peter* II, 21, it was betere to hem to not knowe the weie of rigtwisnesse.

*Apology for the Lollards* p. 38, synne of wichcraft is to not obey.

*Ibid.* p. 57, Poul seiþ, Du þat prechist to not steyl, stelist?

*Transl. Im. Chr.* 4.7, Yf þou wolt lerne & can eny þinge profitably, loue to not be knowen and to be accountyd as nouȝt.

*Ibid.* 24.5, It is liztlier a man ay to be still þan to not excede in wordes.

Pecoock, *Repr.* 16, How schal y wite herbi what vsure is, that y be waar forto not do it?

Id., *Ibid.* 315, Crist 3aue an ensaumple to preestis ..... forto not receyue eny temporal possessiouns.

Further instances *Ibid.* 383, 557, 559 (8 examples), 560 (two examples).

Id., *Donet* 71.17, comaunding to hir..... to not yeue or spende goodis of þe husbandys getyng.

Id., *Ibid.* 127.27 ff., as we ouȝte forto not putte god ..... into eny irreuerence, so we ouȝte forto not putte and vse eny of goddis creaturis ..... into eny to him irreuerence for unworschip.

Id., *Ibid.* 152.36 f., þe comaundement forto not were a cloop maad of lynne and of woole, and þe comaundement forto not eere londe wiþ an hors and asse couplid to gider, abiden now and binden.

Id., *Folwer to the Donet* 15.18, And þerfore it is ful profitable ech man ..... forto not be ouer mych coward.

Id., *Ibid.* 98.1, to þe moral vertue of douȝtynesse it longiþ forto not spare and not forbere eny vertue. Further instances *Ibid.* 94.1; 128.7; 138.9; 138.12; 144.12.

Id., *Reule of Cristen Rel.* 82, þou fadir myȝtist þe sone and þe holy goost forto not be; but what euer persoonys suche þat þey mowe ceese and to not be or be made to not be, þey ben not almyȝty.

Id., *Ibid.* 438, What schulde lette or mone þee forto not releue vs from oure disese?

*Cathol. Angl.* 256, col. 2, to Nott moghe (moght A); nequire, non posse.

This type of split infinitive appears to have been used far into the seventeenth century. The O.E.D. *i.v.* to 20, gives an instance of *to not wonder*, dated 1650. There is a somewhat later one in Butler's *The Lady's Answer to the Knight*,

And if we had not weighty cause To not appear in making laws, We could ..... Force you our managements to bey (*Hudibras*, Chandos Classics, p. 328).

Middle English is also more 'advanced' than Modern English in that the splitting can be brought about by an object. Generally the object is a pronoun (a); a noun object is seldom met with (b).

- a. *Laz. B* 11018, heo cleopede him to alle his wise *for to him reade*.  
*Ibid.* 12683, wei-wittie hernde to þe wateres ..... *for to heom kepe*.  
*Ibid.* 17011, þe king an biþenþe wide his men sende *for to hine finde*.  
*Kentish Sermons*, Morris, O.E. Misc. p. 26, hi wolden gon *for to hyne an-uri*.  
*Curs. M.* 12965 C, he sal þe send Angels *for to þe defend*. (Two other MSS., F and G, have the same reading; T has: *þe for to defende*).  
*Ibid.* 27363 C, þe dai o wreth, o quak and soru, þar nan has might to *oper boru*; (F has: *at oper borou*; not in G and T).  
*St. Alexius*, Laud MS. 108,41, A litel after, wiþ greth hast, þei a-voweden to *him chast*, To here lyues ende.  
*Ayenbite* p. 113, he ne heþ mizte to *hit endi*.  
*Ibid.* p. 177, me ssel yerne to þe vif wittes of þe bodie / huerby me zenneþ wel ofte ..... *Oper be þe mouþe / ine folliche to spekene . ine to moche ethe / and to moche drinke* (Compare *South Eng. Leg.* 286,284, Ich makie freres to *muchel ete*: and to drinke al-so. *To muchel* might mean 'too much'; in connection with the infinitive *to drinke* this is, however, unlikely).  
Chaucer, *Compl. to his Lady* 127, Wel lever is me lyken yow and deye Than *for to any thing or thinke or seye* That mighte yow offende.<sup>1</sup>  
Pecock, *Repr.* 14, it folewith that *for to eny of hem bothe holde* is not but feyned waar.  
Id., *Ibid.* 36, he muste needis grounde *treuthis and conclusions* ..... *for to hem kunne and knowe*.  
Id., *Ibid.* 59, thei not rede and studie in the Bible oonly *for to it leerne*.  
Id., *Ibid.* 102, worthi it is *for to him azenstonde*.  
Further *Ibid.* 10, 13, 102, 183, 398, 449, 495, 546; Id., *Reule* 467.  
b. *Laz. B.* 17170, ac nauest þou neuer one man ..... *for to worck makie*.  
*Curs. M.* C 8318, He sal bath regn in pes and rest, *To temple make* he sal be best (= F; G and T different).  
Pecock, *Donet* 6,24, envie and detraccioun and malice ..... *myzt rise into summe heerers or reders being moche redier for to suche writingis lette and distroie þan* .....

Although Pecock freely splits his infinitives, he only makes a comparatively sparing use of the type illustrated above.

It should be noted that in sometimes placing the object before the verbal element, and not before [*for*] *to*, Pecock is consistent. In the *Repressor* the object, if a personal pronoun, is found before the verb more than twice as often as after it; other pronouns generally follow the verb. Post-position is the rule in the case of noun-objects, although pre-position also occurs<sup>2</sup>. Now, with one exception (as far as my observation goes!), only the personal pronoun figures in the split infinitive; there is but one instance of a noun-object.

As regards the frequent pre-verbal position of pronominal objects, Pecock's syntax is decidedly conservative. In the fifteenth century post-position was becoming more and more usual, and by the beginning of the sixteenth century it had become the rule in prose.

The strict adherence to this rule, deviations from which had become restricted to poetry, probably brought about the disappearance of the *to* + object + infinitive construction.

<sup>1</sup> Kenyon, *Syntax of the Infinitive in Chaucer*, p. 158.

<sup>2</sup> Zickner, *Syntax und Stil in Reginald Pecock's "Repressor"*, Berlin 1900, p. 95 ff.



Apart from five earlier instances of adverbs of manner, adverbial adjuncts, other than *no*, do not seem to occur in the split infinitive in texts dating from before Pecock's time. In his works every variety of the construction as we know it now is met with.

### Adjuncts of manner and degree.

*Passion of our Lord*, Morris, O.E. Misc., 674, Seoppe in alle londes, hi eoden vor to prechen, and for to fully þat folk and godes lawe techen.

*Curs. M.* 18443, Laud MS., Blessid be þou lord off hevyn ..... That suche grace hath sent to his, Synfull men for to þus lede In paradise; (T same).

*Apology for the Lollards* 38, the felowny of ydolatrie [is] to not wel assent.

*Secreta Secretorum* 60, To enserche sciences, and to perfytly knowe alle manere of Naturals þinges (O.E.D. i.v. to, 20).

*Ibid.* 71.36, þe stomak comep feble and losyþ his strengthe to fully sethe þe mete.

Pecock, *Repr.* 2, he takith vpon him for to in neizbourli or brotherli maner correpþe his Cristen neizbour or brother.

Id., *Ibid.* 53, perel is castid forto miche homeli dele with him.

Id., *Ibid.* 91, y haue lefir forto mekeli knowleche that y and thei han failid.

Id., *Ibid.* 219, he schal make hem to be euere truantis in the scole of God, and litil good forto perfytli kunne and litte good forto perfytli wirche.

Id., *Ibid.* 442, Certis it shulde not bicomme me ..... forto so inpertynentli speke.

Id., *Ibid.* 511, we ..... ben bounde forto moost loue.

Id., *Ibid.* 512 [this] ..... hath be a cause in summe of the comoun peple forto ouer vnwijsly and ouer bitterli berke and clatere.

Id., *Donet* 6.15, ouer long it were forto parfytly denounce and notifie vnder what entent y seie and write al what y haue, or schal seie or write.

Id., *Ibid.* 24.1, forto þus do and procede ..... wolde be ouer longe.

Id., *Folewer* 155.9, forto iustli and vertuoseli do a dede contrari to goddis comaundement, or forto iustli and vertuoseli leue vndoon a deede of him comaundid, mai not such delectacioun or eny opir passioun constreynne.

Id., *Reule* 15, þe knowing of þo peyneful punyschingis ..... schal stire hym ful myche bi drede forto the better kepe þe same lawe of god.

Id., *Ibid.* 27, pilk soule schal liue euer wipoute body in abille forto þe cleerer knowe god and godly þingis.

Id., *Ibid.*, 421, wipout such goode werkis performed ..... or wipout parfijt wil to perfoorme hem ..... he schal not be able to fruytefully preie.

Id., *Ibid.*, 434, Persoones ..... no cause hauyng forto maliciouly and so myche harmyn[g]ly lie ..... wroten þe storie of þo þingis ..... þese now seid persones were holy and symple no cause hauing forto maliciouly and perilously and harmynfully lie.

As might be expected, the adverb of manner *so* is often found in the split infinitive in Pecock's works.

*Repr.* 17, neithir requirith and askith Holi Scripture forto so zeue.

*Ibid.*, 24, if thilk now seid cause were sufficient forto so holde, thanne ..... it wolde folewe that ..... Further examples: *Repr.* 115, 269, 317, 459, 461, 508, 536 (two), 549; *Donet* 5.4; 48.7; *Folewer* 42, 97, 106, 144; *Reule* 148, 158, 182, 288, 456.

Anaphoric *so* occurs in the following two quotations:

*Repr.* 75, the power of resoun in him silf is not ordeyned of God to be oure next and best and seurest reuler or reule anentis alle resonable treuthis, but the doom of reson is ordeyned to *so* be.

*Ibid.* 436, it was no nede that manie bischopis schulden be thanne upon dyuerse multitudis of preestis, and that mani archibischopis schulden be thanne upon dyuerse multitudis of bischopis; and nede askith now among Cristen men *forto so be*.

In modern English *so*, if connected with *do*, *say*, etc. has assumed a pronominal function. It does not seem too hazardous to assert that already in Pecock's English *so* does duty for a pronoun, also in the split infinitive.

*Repr.* 25, Schal y scie that an hous hauyng an hundrid feet in brede is grounded upon lond in which he takith not but oon foot? Goddis forbode y schulde be so lewde *forto so seie*.

*Ibid.* 67, it hath be seid to me thus, "that neuere man errid bi reding or studyng in the Bible ....." But certis thei tooke her mark amys: for thei puttiden al her motyue in her affeccoun or wil *forto so trowe*.

*Ibid.*, 269, it is profitable to ech man for to ymagine this freend (scil. Crist) be present to us bodili and in a maner visibili ..... therfore the oolde practik of deuoute Cristen men was *forto so ymagyne*.

*Ibid.*, 362, Boneface the iiije ..... willing *forto* halewe the hous in Rome clepid Panteon, and *forto* make it a temple of alle martris, askide of Focas ..... leue *forto so do*.

*Id.*, *Folewer* 79.13, he comaundip and biddep in his wil to alle opire powers *forto so do*.

*Id.*, *Ibid.* 125.16, to *so do* is azens his nature and kynde. To *so do* also in *Reule* 164 and 456.

### Adjuncts of place.

*Repr.* 222, God chesith oon place bifore an other *forto therinne wirche* holi dedis of myracils.

*Ibid.*, 224, he came ..... into a place in which he leide him down *forto there slepe and reste*.

*Ibid.*, 242, What thanne was the hool thing which thei worschpiden for eny God, good it were *forto here leerne and knowe*.

*Ibid.*, 282 (twice), 285 (twice), 318, *forto in hem dwelle*.

*Ibid.*, 303, *forto on him ride*.

*Ibid.*, 459, which argument y wolde reders in this place *forto thidir turne* and it se.

### Adjuncts of time.

*Repr.* 5, it is miche nede *forto first zeue* bisynes to vnroote and ouerturne tho thre trowngis, holdingis, or opiniouns.

*Ibid.*, 165, And 3it *forto so ofte remembre* we been ful freel and forgeteful.

*Ibid.*, 219, a nurish or a modir is not bounde *forto alwey and for euere* fede her children.

*Ibid.*, 296, ech man thanne standing in apostilhode or disciplihode hadde nede *forto ech dai make* him redi to die bi martirdoom.

*Ibid.*, 556, we han bound us silf for to neuere touche neither bere money.

*Folewer* 103.12, good it is *forto in sum tyme take* be oon maner of preching, and in sum opir tyme an opir maner of prechyng.

*Ibid.*, 112.10, be oon is redi *forto soone moue* be opir.

*Reule* 156, if ..... that a new graunt or 3ifte were maad to vs *forto azen come* to blisse, þilk dede myzt be a deserving.

### Other adverbial adjuncts.

*Repr.* 2, these same wordis ..... mowe weel ynow be take and dressid fethir to ech lay persoon, *forto ther yn zeue* to him instruccoun.

*Ibid.*, 28, men of the contre vplond bringen into Londoun in Mydsomer



eue branchis of trees ..... and bitaken tho to citeseins of Londoun *for*to therwith araie her housis. .

*Ibid.*, 134, Forwhi what other ground than eny of these now rehercid couthe be assigned, *for*to bi it knowe a thing to be vntrewe, no man can seie.

*Ibid.*, 254, *for*to therazens repugne; 363, *for*to ther azens holde; 376, *for*to therof take; 461, *for*to therbi contirfete.

Donet 61.2 ff., it (scil. goostlihode) is oure willing bi which we willep to him goodis which, *for*to to him zeve, or *for*to to him sette, and *for*to fro h[i]m take, it is not a creaturis power.

*Ibid.*, 160.2, it were good zou *for*to in his matter be stille.

Folewer 87.28, *for*to berbi be strong.

Reule 285, to be gouernaunce of douzlines it longeþ *for*to not oonly bigynne and contynue ..... but .....

Among the above quotations there are several in which *to* is separated from the infinitive by two adverbial adjuncts, which, however, are always of the same kind. But occasionally we find two adjuncts belonging to different classes, or an object and an adverbial adjunct.

Repr. 88, ful manye ..... were not worthi *for*to *ther*to vnnethis opene her mouth.

*Ibid.*, 314, Crist himself ..... was ensaumpling bi wey of maundement *for*to him *ther* yn folewe.

*Ibid.*, 342, the peple were vnkinde and vndeouout *for*to sufficiently hem fynde in necessities.

*Ibid.*, 536, he schulde be licencid *for* to so and *ther*to go out of his couent and cloistre.

*Ibid.*, 546, signes *for*to ofte and myche *ther*bi be remembrid.

Donet 6.23, *for*to enye suche bi her owne laboure fynde, make and multiplie.

See also the first quotation under the heading 'Adjuncts of manner and degree'.

Many of Pecock's split infinitives would do credit to a present-day splitter, who, however, rarely goes the length of putting in more than one adverbial adjunct. If he does, the result is generally ludicrous:

Spectators are requested to kindly and at their earliest convenience remove their headgear (Quoted from *Punch* by Wendt, *Syntax* I, 59).

On p. 58 f. l.c. Wendt quotes an amusing passage from a periodical. In this passage the split infinitive is commented upon in connection with the following sentence reported to have been used by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in an 'otherwise noble speech',

The announcement is such as to if it were possible, still more confirm us in our resolve of doing our full duty in the present emergency.

A still more startling example, 'borrowed from a reviewer,' is given by Fowler, *Modern English Usage* p. 561,

A book ..... of which the purpose is thus — 'with a deafening split infinitive — stated by its author: — "Its main idea is to historically, even while events are maturing, and divinely — from the Divine point of view — impeach the European system of Church and States".

Prodigious as these modern splitting achievements are, there occur split infinitives in Pecock's works that quite equal, and even far surpass them. Let the reader judge for himself.

Reule 182, if his man myzte assigne pee, lord, *forto freely and in no weye of his owne dette or of eny oper mannys dette to zeve and paie eny reward to be seid oper man* .....

Donet 30.12 ff., what is it *forto lyue pretyngly* .....? Sone, it is *forto*, at sum whilis, whanne opire profitabler seruicis of god, *pat is to seie*, fynal seruicis of god, schulen not berbi be lettid, and whanne a man in his semyng hap nede to quik him silf in be seid loves, and namelich in moral desiris (whiche here y clepe 'louys' or 'willingis') vpon goodis to come and to be had, a man *forto aske of god* ..... enye ping *pat is to oure behoue*.

Ibid. 31.17 ff., what is it for to lyue bankingly to god .....? Sone, it is *forto*, at sum whilis, whanne opire profitabler seruicis of god schulen not berbi be lettid, and whanne a man in his semyng hap nede to quyke him silf in be seid lovis to god and to him silf and nameliche to moral desires (whiche y clepe here 'loves' or 'willingis') vpon goodis to come and to be had, seie and be aknowe to god ..... *pat he hap receyued benefete or benefetis of god*.

Ibid. 32.9 ff., what is *forto lyue anentis god worschippingly or honouringly* .....? Sone, it is *forto*, at sum whilis, whanne opire fynal seruicis of god, aftir doom of resoun more profitable to be doon, schulen not berbi be lettid, and whanne a man in his semyng [ha]p nede to meke bisynes for to gendre freendful, goostly loue toward god or toward him silf, *worschipe and honoure god*.

The first and the second of these passages are highly curious. When Pecock came to the end of the long string of adjuncts, he had evidently forgotten how he had begun the sentence!

As regards the use of the split infinitive Pecock was far in advance of his time. In other respects his syntax agrees, generally speaking, with what was the usual practice about the middle of the fifteenth century. The split infinitive was not an innovation; only the frequent use of it was new. What made Pecock split his infinitives so often, can only be conjectured. Pecock was not a crank; he could not afford to defeat his own purposes by using uncouth language. His English must have been of the type spoken in intellectual circles in Oxford, where he led the life of a student and scholar for about twenty years.

Grammatical or stylistic peculiarities may characterize the speech in use in certain localities or among certain classes. The progressive form is at present used far more freely in 'broad' Scotch than in Standard English; euphuism was a kind of fashion among the higher classes in the second half of Queen Elizabeth's reign, and it is not at all unthinkable that in Pecock's time the split infinitive was much in vogue among Oxford 'clerkes'. It is most unfortunate that there are no other texts written in Oxford about that time.

Whatever may have been the cause of Pecock's partiality for the split infinitive, he did not initiate a new era as regards this syntactical peculiarity. For about three centuries after his disappearance the split infinitive remained as rare as it was when he began to write, and even at the present time there is probably not one splitter who could hold his own against Pecock.



## Notes and News.

**Examen Engels M.O. B. 1932.** Onderwerpen voor het letterkundig opstel:

1. The poems in MS. Cotton A. X. as characteristic productions of the fourteenth century.
2. The purity motif in *Cleanness* and its treatment.
3. Chaucer and the medieval romance.
4. The *Nunne Prestes Tale* as a travesty of human life.
5. Langland was a satirist, not a revolutionary.
6. Discuss the character of Piers, the Ploughman, and the place he occupies in the poem named after him.
7. The figure of Tristram in the earlier and later versions of the story.
8. Swinburne's treatment of the Tristram story.
9. Milton as a champion of liberty.
10. Discuss Milton's *Ode on the Morning of Christ's Nativity*.
11. Pope as a literary critic.
12. *Windsor Forest* is characteristic of the poet and his age. Discuss.
13. The poorer classes in the poetry of the eighteenth century.
14. Neo-classic and romantic elements in Cowper's poetry.
15. Personal elements in Coleridge's poetry.
16. Discuss Coleridge's criticism of Wordsworth's theories.
17. The growth of Keats's poetic powers as shown by a comparison between *Endymion* and *Hyperion*.
18. *The Pot of Basil*, a typically Keatsian poem.
19. The relation between nature and man in Shelley's poetry.
20. The dramatic qualities of *The Cenci*.
21. Mrs. Gaskell's attitude to the social questions of her age.
22. Mrs. Gaskell as a biographer.
23. The influence of suffering on character in George Eliot's novels.
24. *Romola*, a tragedy of lost opportunities.
25. The sensuous and the spiritual in Rossetti's poetry.
26. *Jenny* as a dramatic monologue.
27. Discuss the influence of circumstance and heredity on character in Hardy's novels.
28. Tragedy and irony in *Jude the Obscure*.
29. Why has Meredith never been a popular novelist?
30. Meredith's method of characterization as exemplified in *The Egoist*.

---

## Reviews.

*Meaning and Change of Meaning with special reference to the English Language.* By GUSTAV STERN. Göteborg 1931. Pp. xiii+456. Price 15 Kronor.

It would take a second Dean Swift to do satiric justice to the battle that has been raging round the word Meaning for the last twelve years. The battle reflected little credit on the combatants: each fought under his own standard, with his own weapons, according to his own rules, and not a few, covertly or avowedly, for their own cause. The subject of dispute was, strange enough, precisely the nature of their weapons and the uses they could be lawfully put to. Abandoning the metaphor: with words they fought about words, through meaning they reached out after meaning, each as the spirit moved him, and they fondly hoped that from this sweet lawlessness fixity of rule would ultimately accrue..... Now that the battle shows signs of petering out and there is time for a glance backward we can only wonder that, previous to

1920, when *Mind* opened its columns to a symposium on *The Meaning of Meaning*, logicians and psychologists devoted so little of their time to a notion that is so vital to all the issues with which they are concerned. As late as 1919 Mr. Bertrand (now Lord) Russell, in an address to the Aristotelian Society complained that "logicians had done very little towards explaining the relation called meaning"; and a quarter of a century earlier Lady Welby had deplored the fact that "sense in the meaning sense had never been taken as a centre to work out from". The general attitude among logicians seems to have been that of the man in the street: "Meaning? Why, meaning is just meaning, that's all there is to it." So physicists had said: "Time is just time" ..... until Einstein appeared upon the scene and sprang a series of surprises upon these too facile commentators.

Those unfamiliar with the relevant literature will find it difficult to realize how strange and conflicting was the terminology which even notable philosophers brought to the straightening out of the Meaning tangle, thereby showing the urgent necessity for a complete restatement of the problem and a fresh normative approach.

The latest contribution to something like a final solution was made by Gustav Stern of Göteborg in Sweden, who, in a powerful volume of 420 large and close-printed pages, has crystallized the results of several years study of the subject. The book is so full of matter, raises so many issues, relevant and irrelevant, testifies to such wide learning and exhaustive knowledge of the Meaning literature, as to be unsusceptible of concise statement. A bare abstract of its contents, an appreciation of its leading features, a few observations on the many questions which are discussed in this magisterial work is all that a reviewer to whom time is an object can attempt.

Through 45 pages of close analysis the author leads up to a definition of *Meaning* (p. 45), and having added a rider or two, with which I disagree, proceeds in the fourth chapter "to elaborate and fill in" his definition. After a two-chapter intermezzo on the production and comprehension of speech, he then applies the results of the opening three chapters to a general theory of "Sense-Change" and a classification of the changes of meaning. These changes, according to the author, fall into seven classes: Substitution, Analogy, Shortening, Nomination, Transfer, Permutation and Adequation, to each of which one of the seven closing chapters is devoted.

Mr. Stern proposes the following definition: "The meaning of a word — in actual speech — is identical with those elements of the user's (speaker's and hearer's) subjective apprehension of the referent denoted by the word, which he apprehends by it." This definition, in which speaker and hearer are somewhat loosely bracketed as 'users', supposes that the interpretation of the word-symbol is successful, in other words that the hearer makes a reference similar in all relevant respects to that made by the speaker. It further assumes that the meaning of a word is a psychic entity. This assumption is open to question. It may be a psychologist's convenience to view the meaning of a word as a psychic entity, it is not a linguist's. To a linguist — and to the reviewer — meaning is an essential element of the relation between a symbol (the word) and what the symbol stands for. To explain. If a person asks a doctor friend: "What exactly do you mean by idiosyncrasy?", the word '*mean*' simply signifies '*refer to*'. If the answer to the question is given thus: "Idiosyncrasy means an abnormal reaction in certain persons to certain drugs or other agencies", the word '*means*' still stands for '*refers to*': yet with a



difference. 'Means' in the answer to the question is shorthand for: "is used by the speaker as a symbol for", or "is used by the speaker as a symbol to refer to", and expanding these notions into a definition: Only when used as symbols words can be said to have meaning, the meaning of a word or words being that to which the speaker using it, or them, makes a reference, where making a reference stands for: the speaker's mind being adjusted to the referent as part of a context (external and psychological).

Now it must not be supposed that these two definitions are *toto caelo* different or that they could not be made into a common basis for profitable discussion. If Mr. Stern unduly stresses the subjective element of the relation between symbol and referent, he is aware that there is an objective side to the 'subjective apprehension' of his definition — and very large it looms in most of his subsequent discussions —; this objective side has been given greater prominence in the reviewer's definition, without neglect of the subjective element, and in better accordance, it is believed, with the interpretation placed upon the word 'meaning' by responsible users of words. Nor must it be forgotten that, as long as we don't go beyond the obvious import of the definition, no very deep and vital issues are involved. It is when its terms come up for further discussion and elucidation that differences of opinion are bound to appear. Most of the difficulties incidental to a careful elaboration of 'meaning' centre round the symbols reference and referent: what they stand for, how they are related.

On page 33 the question is discussed "whether meaning and referent can coincide, wholly or in part". On the basis of his definition the author rejects the possibility of coincidence for material objects. As regards abstract referents he expresses himself more cautiously and while not entirely deprecating Stumpf's opinion, which favours identity, he yet inclines to Husserl's view which admits distinction. The question will have to be more precisely stated to be susceptible of satisfactory solution. Abstract referents are so dissimilar, the references we make to them so subtle and complex, there are so many levels of interpretation and generalization, that a fuller analysis of the notion *abstract* is necessary before the question can even be stated with scientific exactness. What Mr. Stern says on referent and meaning of *relativity* is not convincing. If the apprehension of relativity "varies widely for different individuals as well as for the same individual on different occasions", the distinction between trans-subjective and apprehended relativity becomes illusory, for the simple reason that there is no such thing as trans-subjective relativity. If there is, it must be capable of statement; whether it is so capable will soon be settled by actual trial. Many of the difficulties attaching to the relations between signs, symbols, things and thought will disappear with a detailed and accurate analysis of the way in which we refer to our referents. To such analysis Mr. Stern devotes many pages and deep thought and on the whole I can readily fall in with his views and deductions — subject to minor adjustments made necessary by differences in definition — but there is one point where I have a serious quarrel with him. It concerns the precise meaning of the sentence *there flies a bird*. On page 40 I read: "The sentence *there flies a bird* has not the same meaning when used of a fluttering sparrow, of a swallow, of an eagle, and so in a variety of circumstances. Although the words remain unaltered the meaning changes with the referent."

To me this is quite unacceptable. The very idea that this simple sentence should have as many meanings as there are birds capable of flight, should

have given the author pause to consider the import of his statement, which affects references not only to birds but to the members of any other class. I take it that the author, in using the words "the meaning changes with the referent", means that the change of meaning is *caused* by the change of referent. The referent in the example adduced is a complex one: there is the spatial relation indicated by *there*, there is the *bird*, there is the action of *flying*, the three united in such a way as to give the required structure to the compound referent. Now the problem of finding the proper meaning of the words *there flies a bird* resolves itself, in the words of the author's definition, into the following: find the elements of the referent which the speaker apprehends as expressed by the four words, or, if the speaker is a suitable interpreter of his own symbols: find a minimum of elements in the referent, for which *there flies a bird* is a suitable symbol. Anything beyond that is gratuitously assumed, and outside the meaning. But the four words of the sentence are a suitable symbol neither for the species of bird nor for the species of flight it happens to affect: therefore I conclude that the species of both bird and flight are outside the meaning and cannot therefore affect the meaning when changed. The precise meaning of the sentence under discussion depends upon the precise meaning of *bird* and *flight*. By bird we mean a member of the bird-class, that is to say: bird symbolizes the common properties in virtue of which a bird belongs to the class denoted by the word; by *flight* we refer to the common features of the action of birds disporting themselves in the air. And let it not be urged that these common properties and features cannot be accurately defined. They cannot be and need not be. Language is not more accurate than it is, but what it loses in accuracy it gains in versatility, plasticity, convenience and usefulness. Words as symbols may be inaccurate: for ordinary purposes and supported by context they serve; in extreme cases and in exact discourse all relevant terms must be defined. To quote one amusing example. Most people will admit that the phrase *to walk round a thing* symbolizes a fairly closely defined reference. But let a person walk in a circle of say twelve feet across round an office stool on which a monkey is perched who turns so as to keep facing him: does that person walk round the monkey? Opinions will differ until *to walk round a thing* has been given a closer definition. — Again it cannot be brought up against the above explanations that the common properties and features of the members of a set have no subsistence of their own, are in fact identified with them. The answer is that that does not prevent us from referring to them without referring to the members that support them. The mind referring is not like a finger that wants something in front of it in order to be able to prod it — the mind notes, compares, becomes aware of common properties and features and prescinding from the 'substances' in which they are inherent, succeeds in making them the object of its own act, quite as if they were self-supporting elements, which of course they are not. Whether these generalizations and abstractions are more than a logician's convenience need not detain us; they are certainly linguistic necessities, if for no other reason because we cannot remember millions of names and if we could there would be no time to agree upon them. We cannot be expected to know the more than eighty thousand species of coleoptera which the earth harbours, but it is convenient to have the homely word *beetle* to symbolize their common properties.

On pp. 39-40 I find a statement which calls for comment: "two persons may without difficulty converse about a referent of which they have the most



dissimilar ideas, if only they refer to the same object all the time." Whether they can do so depends entirely upon the level at which their discourse moves. If one doctor thinks Mr. A. is a heart patient with a flawed lung, another believing him to be an advanced diabetic with a renal complaint, they may without difficulty converse about Mr. A.'s social standing, his distinction as a barrister, they cannot discuss him as a patient. Similarly for two persons conversing about a camera (p. 40).

Questions of referents and reference are intimately connected with what is called Substitution on pages 166, 192. Here again I do not quite see eye to eye with the author in his views on this type of sense change. Is it true that with progressing technical development of ships there is a *pari-passu* development in the symbols denoting them? What is it that will make us call the gigantic Cunarder that is on the stocks at Clydebank, a ship? That she has quadruple screw geared machinery? that she may or may not be fitted with Frahm trimming-tanks? that she can do her thirty knots without lifting the machinery off the bed-plates? These things are neither included nor excluded by the symbol *ship*, they are simply not referred to. A ship is (broadly) any sea-going vessel, not under a certain size, and if we use the word to symbolize a reference to a member of the ship-class, we refer to such a member at what may be called the ordinary level of interpretation and this reference determines the meaning. If we wish to make a reference to an individual ship, *qua* individual, or to a member of a special class of ships, the word *ship* is not by itself a suitable symbol for it; it will have to be supplemented by context (perceptual or verbal), or proper names, compounds, special class nouns will have to be used e.g. Berengaria, Conte di Savoia, sailing-ship, power-ship, clipper, schooner etc.

It should not be forgotten that the correspondence between the references of hearer and speaker are never exact. Fields of reference are not rigidly defined and overlaps along the edges must be expected. Where identity cannot be achieved we are satisfied with similarity, similarity sufficient to allow of profitable discussion. Identity of reference is therefore a matter of degree, and indiscernibles are taken as identicals. This however is not the point at issue. We are not discussing the boundaries of references but words and their uses as symbols. My quarrel with the author is that he invests words with more symbolizing power than they actually carry, and in the same proportion fails to do justice to the symbolizing capacity of the context of situation.

To conclude a long review I will make a few observations which occurred to me as I was struggling through Mr. Stern's powerful tome.

I cannot view *hard* (p. 275) in the sense *hard labour* as a graphic shortening (p. 253), nor yet as an instance of sense change. *Hard*, dissociated from context never symbolizes a reference to hard labour, and if it seems to do so it is always the verbal or external context that does the symbolizing. The expression never occurs without a number (definite or indefinite) of years or months prefixed to it, and is always used in what we may for convenience call a crime-situation, and the reference to labour is symbolized by the whole expression rather than by the single word *hard*. To take another illustration. The sentence *there must be a short somewhere* is, as a symbol divorced from its context, hardly intelligible. We have only to supply a suitable context to it, by supposing the word to have been spoken by an electrician who is puzzled by the erratic conduct of an electric current in a set of wires, to know at once that the reference is to a *short circuit*. In the same way, I suppose that *sharps*,

*blunts*, *betweens* symbolize nothing to most people; over the haberdasher's counter they refer to needles. I conclude that these and similar words have not really changed their meaning and add that if, according to a modified definition of sense-change, they had, these changes would be of no interest to the semasiologist.

These examples are not fundamentally different from the following: There were physicians of high repute and medical quacks of very *low*. It was a slow business and a *toilful* (one). Here again, the reference to *repute* and *business*, as regards *low* and *toilful*, is contained in the text. It should be remarked that *one* is a non-symbol word, concerning which some amusing profundities may be found in the works of our leading grammarians.

What Mr. Stern says on Relational Shifts (p. 349) stands in need of much qualification. I cannot with the best intention see anything illogical in phrases like *a big eater*, *a first offender*, and therefore Mr. Feldkeller's appended explanation of the alleged illogicality is to me meaningless and chimerical. Incidentally, I do not know what "strictly logical syntax" is; to me syntax admits degrees of convenience, not of logicalness. Whenever we qualify a substantive by an adjective, to speak with grammarians, we make what may be analogically called a reference to the thing symbolized by the substantive. Here again there may be various levels of interpretation and the mental process may be variously adjusted to the thing referred to. Thus if we use the phrase *a fat plumber* the reference is to the man who happens to be a plumber; had we said *a skilful plumber* the reference would have been to the man *qua* plumber. Again, in the phrase *an ugly customer* the epithet does not refer to features but to drastic unscrupulous dealings with others. There is nothing illogical in any of these expressions. More serious offences against the "proper" uses of adjectives would seem to be the following: *extraditable offences*, *fat, sedentary calves* (the fleshy part of the leg), *syncopated artists* (coloured gentlemen discoursing rag-time music on the saxophone and other weapons of offence), *a fast cricket-pitch*, *the foreign editor* and many others. Even these are not illogical and most of them would seem to be amenable to plausible interpretation on the lines indicated above. They are shorthand expressions and interesting to the epistemologist rather than to the semasiologist, their irregularity, if any, consisting in the adjective-symbols being used for making a reference via a second referent to which they are normally adapted and for the correct interpretation of which they make a demand on the hearer's knowledge. Thus the phrase *sedentary calves* will not be readily understood by one who is unacquainted with sedentary life and the effect of such a life upon the human body and the fleshy part of its legs. *Syncopated artists* is an empty phrase to one who has never heard of syncopated music. Attempts at a comprehensive explanation will not get much beyond the statement that in the attribution of adjectives to substantives English rule-of-thumb rules supreme. We do not hold with Bernard Shaw that the evolution is towards Pidgin English as the classic English of the future, but we admit and resign ourselves to the fact "that the limits of correctness are sometimes obviously exceeded" (p. 350). Even so we must bear in mind another of Shaw's sayings — exaggerated but containing a tangible element of truth —: "Always remember: there is no correct English, we all speak differently". (from a speech at Letchworth on "Libraries and the English Language".)

The interpretation given of *whistle* in the phrase: "Lucky that Klepper knows my whistle" (*Quentin D.* XVIII) will hardly commend itself to born English-

men. The reference is not to the kind of whistle for which Franklin's nephew paid too much, but to the variety which proceeds from pursed-up human lips. *Whistle*, in the above quotation, is as clearly a new formation from the verb as it is in: He gave a low whistle with a very long gamut. Any reference to the offensive little instrument seems to me impossible.

On page 253 I find: "Haplogy may be a *cause*<sup>1</sup> of phonetic shortening"; and again on page 264: "when a negation is put at the head of the sentence, it is liable to disappear *owing to*<sup>1</sup> prosiopesis"; among the examples of page 275 we read: "a blue (-stocking; *clipping* ?<sup>1</sup>)", which I expand in accordance with the other quotations into "owing to clipping?" This is the kind of loose slipshod writing that leads to intellectual confusion and would lay a less distinguished scholar open to the suspicion of having come under the spell of his own words and in any case is not very commendable in the writings of a professed dealer in Meaning.

Haplogy, prosiopesis and clipping do not cause or explain shortenings, they are names for them. Does the author view prosiopesis as some linguistic principle that influences the poor efforts of users of speech? Does he refer to Mr. Jespersen's highly controvertible explanation of the phenomenon? Taking the words at their face value they can only mean: when a negation is put at the head of a sentence it is liable to disappear owing to being suppressed, which deserves to be given a place in Mr. Punch's columns under the heading: "Glimpses of the Obvious". It is really as bad, if not so amusing, as Uncle Bräsig's dictum in the Reform Club: "Die grosse Armut in der Stadt kommt von der grossen Powerteh her."

These occasional lapses from the book's normally high standard of exact diction, together with a certain wordiness and fondness for explaining the obvious are blemishes in an otherwise excellent work. Had the author seen his way to digesting it into one third of its present size, he would of necessity have cut out much irrelevant matter and earned the gratitude of at least one reader.

Mr. Stern's contribution to the theory of meaning consists as much in the systematization of the semantic changes as in an exhaustive study of the forces underlying them. On the practical value of the classifications it is too early to pronounce. They are essentially labels to be attached to ascertained sense changes and as such they have their uses, their limits and their dangers. Their uses will be obvious to any one who has given the book even a cursory reading; their limits are given by their imperfect definition and consequent frequent overlapping; the danger consists in their being mistaken as sources of information concerning sense change. A discussion which of the seven labels applies to a given change of meaning will as a rule — except in very simple cases — yield indifferent results and as often as not peter out in a fruitless argument on the exact meaning of the terms employed. That the danger is not imaginary can be proved from the author's paragraphs. To me the theoretical discussions are the most attractive part of the book. If I do not always share the author's views let it be remembered that at the present stage of development of the meaning problem two scholars cannot be expected to agree at all points of the compass.

Amsterdam.

C. VAN SPAENDONCK.

---

<sup>1</sup> My italics.



*The life and death of Sr Thomas Moore, knight, sometymes Lord high Chancellor of England*, written in the tyme of Queene Marie by Nicholas Harpsfield, L. D., and now edited from eight manuscripts, with collations, textual notes, etc., by ELSIE VAUGHAN HITCHCOCK; with an Introduction on the Continuity of English Prose from Alfred to More and his School, a Life of Harpsfield, and Historical Notes by R. W. CHAMBERS. London: published for the Early English Text Society by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1932. Pp. ccxxx + 400. 36s net.

This is a noble book. It is significant of its wide interest that it has been reviewed not only in the *Times Literary Supplement* (Aug. 18, 1932) but also in the daily *Times* (Sept. 9, 1932): it is one of those rare books which, while satisfying fully the most exacting demands of modern scholarship, are yet thoroughly readable, human documents, appealing to and influencing a circle many times larger than that of the specialists. As a critical edition it is a model of accurate and sensitive scholarship, a rich mine of material all of the very greatest value, and it contains a wealth of matter rarely found within the covers of a single volume. Withal it wears its learning lightly. It is a pleasure to repeat the judgment of the *Times Literary Supplement*: "It is an achievement in English scholarship of the highest order, a work of astonishing range and minute thoroughness, but above all it is a cheerful book, full of entertainment."

There is here all that could be desired in the way of commentary, both from what we may call the narrower and the wider point of view. The book falls into two parts. There is first the edition proper, consisting of the *Life of More* and the Introductions and Notes immediately concerning it. This is in large part the work of Dr. Hitchcock, who deserves the highest praise for the admirable way in which she has performed a difficult task. The text, based on the MS. in Emmanuel College, Cambridge, is established from a full collation, printed at the foot of each page, with the seven other MSS. — this itself no light labour. But Miss Hitchcock's work has not ended here: the settling of a reading has often necessitated pursuing the inquiry beyond the *Life* itself, to More's own *Works*, and also to its principal source, Roper's *Notes*, which has involved examining and weighing the somewhat larger group of a dozen or so Roper MSS. The contribution to the Harpsfield text of the Roper MSS. is contained in ten pages of Textual Notes (pp. 283-93). In parenthesis, we may no doubt hope soon to see Miss Hitchcock's edition of Roper.

Attention has been called to the editing of the text because, where there is so much else besides, it is easy to take this merely for granted and to overlook the vast amount of exact and exacting labour involved in its preparation, especially here where the collations keep their just place and do not, as so often happens, overwhelm the text. In this matter the Press is to be commended for the nice adjustment of proportions in the size of the types for the text and footnote variants which results in an attractive and eminently readable page that, while containing the full critical apparatus, does not repel the non-specialist. Miss Hitchcock has also supplied a Table of Contents, a running marginal summary, and a short Glossary.

The *Life* is followed, in four Appendices, by various supplementary texts, in critical editions with their own apparatus. First (pp. 219-52) come the important Rastell Fragments, all that remains of a lost *Life of More*, on a much larger scale even than Harpsfield's, by William Rastell, More's nephew

and the printer of his English Works. The extant fragments, relating principally to Bishop Fisher and including a vivid account of his execution, (of which Rastell was an eyewitness — see p. 224, ll. 18-19), are also valuable evidence for such matters as the packing of the Parliament of 1529 and the plot to entrap Fisher and More. Next follows (pp. 253-66) an additional source for the latter part of Harpsfield's *Life*, the *Paris News Letter*, a contemporary account of More's trial and execution circulated on the Continent, here edited for the first time from the eight MSS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale. Appendices III and IV contain the official Indictment of More (pp. 267-76), which strikingly confirms Harpsfield's accuracy, and More's Epitaph in Chelsea Old Church (pp. 277-81).

Miss Hitchcock's work is completed by a description, as the first section of the Introduction (pp. xiii-xx), of the Harpsfield MSS. Professor Chambers' contribution opens with a discussion of the Relationship of the Harpsfield MSS. (pp. xxi-xliv), "a fascinating monograph on the principles of textual induction and the significance of Dr. Hitchcock's collations" (*Times Lit. Supp.*): even what is, usually at least, the duller part of the business yields to Prof. Chambers' cheerfulness, in an illuminating essay that loses none of its soundness and accuracy by being entertaining reading.

The section on the Life and Works of Nicholas Harpsfield (pp. clxxv-ccxiv) is an admirable piece of research in which, from much material collected with great industry for the first time, Prof. Chambers succeeds in disentangling the biography of the neglected author of the *Life of More* (who has hitherto been generally confused with his brother John) and gives us a clear and sympathetic account of him.

Prof. Chambers' work on this part of the book is concluded by seventy-four pages of Historical Notes (pp. 297-370) which form a contribution to More's biography of the greatest importance. Among the most valuable may be mentioned the notes on the date of More's birth (pp. 298-303), his embassies to Flanders and France (pp. 315-17), his authorship of the *History of Richard III* (pp. 336-8), his letter to the King about the Nun of Canterbury (pp. 344-5), the packing of the Reformation Parliament (pp. 350-2), Elyot and Charles V's praise of More (pp. 353-5), the story of Rich's perjury (pp. 363-8), and the material collected by Miss Jay relating to More's City activities (pp. 312-14).

The book contains also reproductions of Holbein's sketch of the More household, as frontispiece, and of the beautiful diptych of Erasmus and Peter Giles painted by Quentin Matsys for presentation to More. Besides these there are photos of the More Tomb in Chelsea Old Church and of a page of the Emmanuel MS.

This is generous measure indeed — but there is more. Pages xlv to clxxiv of the Introduction are occupied by what may be regarded as the second part of the book, an essay by Prof. Chambers on the Continuity of English Prose from Alfred to More and his School. At first sight the immediate connection of this with the rest of the book might be questioned, and there has, indeed, been a demand, satisfied by the publishers (see *English Studies* XIV, 5, pp. 203-4), that this should be issued separately. Yet, as we shall see, it is an essential part of the book, and there will be few, we think, who, having read this essay, will rest satisfied until they have their Harpsfield as well.

Chesterton has said that "the biography of anybody ought really to begin with the words, 'In the beginning God created heaven and earth'... the only

right way of telling a story is to begin at the beginning — at the beginning of the world" — a typically Chestertonian statement of a fundamentally sound principle that here is peculiarly applicable, for the beginning has not hitherto been told.

Prof. Chambers is concerned with estimating the position of Harpsfield and his *Life of More* in the history of English literature, and he finds that this involves a drastic reconsideration of the whole development of English prose. First and foremost, Harpsfield's *Life* is the official biography commissioned by More's son-in-law, William Roper, and based on material supplied by him. Harpsfield corrects and rearranges Roper's *Notes* and adds matter of his own from various sources, among other things with conspicuous success reconstructing More's trial from divergent accounts. Secondly, as Prof. Chambers says, "This eminent Englishman was the writer of a book which has a claim to be the first scholarly biography extant in English" (p. xlv), and it is a full biography: "His is the first serious attempt at a complete *Life* of More, with an account of his literary work" (p. cciv). But it is much more than this. The *Times* reviewer says that this book "concerns matters of moment to all who care about English prose and about English biography, all who read their Bible, and all who like to know on what grounds they may praise famous men and their fathers that begat them". Here we pass from Harpsfield to his subject, for his further literary importance is closely bound up with that of Sir Thomas More himself.

In this eloquent essay Prof. Chambers claims for More a high place as a writer of the first importance, neglect of whom has led to grave misconceptions regarding the history of English prose. He explains at length how it has been possible for so great a writer to be completely ignored, and shows how, contrary to accepted opinion, the main stream of development that culminates in the noble prose of the Authorized Version proceeds, not through Mandeville or Pecoock or Fortescue or Malory (all highly individual writers) nor through the "*nouveaux riches* Elizabethans, with their euphuism and what not" (*The Times*), but from the first emergence of a vernacular prose in Old English times, through an early religious literature the tradition of which continues unbroken (when all else was submerged in French or Latin) into Middle English, from Alfred through Ælfric to the *Ancren Riwele*, to the fourteenth-century mystics, Rolle, Hilton and others, down to More and his School as the immediate begetters of what else appears a miracle unheralded and alone. Restored to their place More and his followers, Roper, Harpsfield, Rastell and others, explain so much. More is "the first Englishman to evolve an effective prose, sufficient for all the purposes of his time: eloquent, dramatic, varied" (p. liii) — he is the precursor, in the direct line, not only of the Authorised Version, but also of the lively dramatic dialogue of Shakespeare and the Elizabethan dramatists. It is to be noted that the establishment of the continuity of English prose involves the restoration as vital links in the chain of development of the Late Old English period and the Fifteenth Century, which Prof. Chambers defends vigorously against the charges of decadence and futility usually levelled against them.

The explanation of this neglect of More takes us beyond literature. A recent critic has justly said: "matters of style, important as they are, are secondary to More's fundamental thoughts; to his position as Utopian, as Chancellor and as Martyr." More laid down his life in defence of a Faith that England has rejected. But that did not prevent Dean Swift from declaring More a person "of the greatest virtue this kingdom ever produced", nor Ben



Jonson and the great Doctor from allowing More his due place in English literature. And lately Chesterton has said that More "may come to be counted the greatest Englishman, or at least the greatest historical character in English history." But there is a widespread view that sees grave flaws in More's character. To the historians especially he appears a strange union of conflicting contraries, an example of a man who, liberal and enlightened in youth, turned later to a narrow intolerance and died in a mistaken cause. So, as Prof. Chambers has elsewhere said, "They have honoured More as a hero, but censured him as a thinker." This view he has already combatted, demonstrating it as false. It is a striking illustration of the impossibility of separating More the writer from More the martyr. For Prof. Chambers has shown how his English writings, mostly defending the Faith for which he died, were not reprinted in Protestant England. By the nineteenth century only his *Utopia* was generally accessible, and, the ideas, social, political and religious, of this being accepted literally as his own serious opinions, More was then hailed as in his youth a herald of rationalism and socialism who in later life incomprehensibly reverted to the outworn superstitions of a system he had himself exposed. Thus, from partial evidence, More has come, indeed, to be praised for the wrong things.

The *Utopia*, admittedly puzzling when considered by itself, need no longer receive exclusive attention, but may be relegated to its due place amidst much other less equivocal material. For the great body of More's English writings is at last being made available, and in these we find his opinions expressed consistently from first to last in unambiguous terms. And nowhere is there any contradiction, any contrast between his early and later views.

This brings us back to the early *Lives* of More. These, which have shared his neglect, are hardly less important for the complete vindication of More's character than his own writings, for they give us a picture of him as he appeared to those who were closest to him and knew him best. This is the supreme importance of Harpsfield and his *Life of More*: as Prof. Chambers says, "Coming just before the Elizabethan religious settlement, which was deeply to affect all English life, Harpsfield gives us an outlook which, if we would understand things, we must recapture. I think that it is in this that the value of his biography above all consists..... it is a complete study of More, written by a man who is so nearly a contemporary, and whose standpoint is so near to More's own, that he can see no inconsistency in the author of *Utopia* and the bosom friend of Erasmus having given his life on behalf of the unity of Christendom. To Harpsfield, More's career seems to be a life of rigid consistency, such as it is not given to many men to live" (pp. xlviii-xlix).

A final word. It is notable that the rehabilitation of More is largely the work of non-Catholic scholars, and no less notable is the honesty and sympathy with which they have accepted him whole-heartedly for what he really was. And it seems very fitting that the new edition of More's English Works, which with Harpsfield's *Life of More* is part payment of the debt that England owes to More, is being published by His Majesty's printers.

These, then, are the matters to which Prof. Chambers and Dr. Hitchcock have devoted their labours in this great volume. We owe them our most grateful thanks, and we may confidently say of their book, as was said of More's *Richard III*, that it 'doth content all men.'

Nijmegen.

W. A. G. DOYLE-DAVIDSON.

*William Shakespeare. A Study of Facts and Problems.* By E. K. CHAMBERS. 2 vols. xviii + 567, xv + 448 pp. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 1930. 42/—.

As the title indicates, this monumental study presents two very different aspects. One would say that it falls into two distinct halves, were it not that facts and problems often jostle each other on the same page. Thus the dual character of the work, which is a history as well as a controversy, is made rather conspicuous. In the light of recent Shakespeare studies we realize that this could scarcely be otherwise, but it remains a significant fact that an author, three centuries after his death, proves to be no more a subject for dispassionate treatment by a specialist than a contemporary like D. H. Lawrence is for the critic of to-day.

Volume I opens with a chapter on Shakespeare's origin and early life in Warwickshire up to 1584, after which there is a gap of eight years, which extensive research has so far not been able to fill up except with unsubstantiated conjecture. Even the meagre supply of authenticated facts regarding the first two decades of the poet's life strikes one as discouraging in view of all the labour that has been spent on the subject since Nicholas Rowe's first systematic biography of Shakespeare, published in 1709. Yet it is a hopeful sign that little more than a year ago new and valuable material was discovered by Mr. Leslie Hotson (*The Atlantic Monthly* of October 1931) which sheds new light on Shakespeare's life in London, discredits still further the already dubious deer-stealing story and furnishes us with an alternative, and far more likely, prototype of Justice Shallow. Had this discovery been made a year earlier, pages 18 to 21 of Sir Edmund's book would not have appeared in their present form. But it speaks highly for his prudence in matters biographical that after this subsequent discovery there is nothing in the actual wording on the pages mentioned that requires revision, except the remark that 'some hit at Sir Thomas [Lucy] is probably involved in the *Merry Wives of Windsor* passage', and even here the author has safeguarded his statement by the adverb.

After a chapter dealing with the complicated conditions of the London stage in 1592, the author takes up the thread of the life of Shakespeare, by now a dramatist and actor. Sir Edmund does not take the evidence for a possible journey to Italy between the years 1592 and 1594 as conclusive. Even familiarity with minute points of local topography may have been learnt 'through books and the visits of others, or through converse with some of the many Italians resident in London' (p. 61). One wonders if Miss Violet M. Jeffery's article in the *Modern Language Review* of January 1932 on Shakespeare's Venice with its painstaking location of the Sagittary may have lessened Sir Edmund's reluctance to concede at least a measure of plausibility to the conjecture of a stay in Italy.

On the same page (p. 61) we come across the first symptoms of a curious diffidence in the author, which shows itself repeatedly in his pages, to draw conclusions from available material or endorse the conclusions others have drawn therefrom, a diffidence which, doubtless born of a commendable regard for scientific reasoning, is at times apt to turn into a less commendable disregard of facts. Referring to the dedicatory epistles prefixed to *Venus and Adonis* (1593) and *Lucrece* (1594) he says: 'A super-subtle criticism detects a great advance in the poet's intimacy with his patron between the two

addresses, which I am bound to say is not apparent to me.' He then proceeds to lift out of these epistles a couple of parallel phrases which, indeed, do not show any progress in intimacy. Availing myself of the same liberty, I will quote the opening phrase of the dedication of *Venus and Adonis*, which runs 'I know not how I shall offend in dedicating my unpolished lines to your lordship', and that of the dedication of *Lucrece*: 'The love I dedicate to your lordship is without end', and leave the reader to decide whether the difference in tone does not, at least, strongly suggest an advance in intimacy. Whether Sir Edmund's unwillingness to admit this has or has not anything to do with his modestly stated belief that the sonnets were addressed to William Herbert rather than to Southampton, I do not know. Nor is it, in view of the recurrence of this disposition to run away from facts, necessary or just to assume any such connection. But if one applauds again and again, in reading Chambers's work, his freedom from any taint of what the Germans call 'hineininterpretieren', one feels at other times tempted to coin for his procedure the word 'hinausinterpretieren'. Chambers is, no doubt, right in refuting the arguments of Sarrazin, Quiller-Couch and Gray that the portraiture of Nym in *Henry V* and *Merry Wives of Windsor* or of Jaques in *As You Like It* may constitute the 'purge' which according to William Kempe 'our fellow Shakespeare hath given' Jonson after the latter had given the poets a 'pill' in his *Poetaster*, for Shakespeare's three plays were written before Jonson's. But, in the face of the assertion in *Parnassus* 3 that it was Shakespeare who gave the purge, it seems to me highly adventurous to suppose, as Chambers does (p. 72), that probably the purge was *Satiromastix* itself. Even though the Cambridge writer overlooked the fact that Kempe had left the Chamberlain's men in 1599, the assumption is scarcely warranted that he mixed up Shakespeare with Dekker.

A short excursion into aesthetic criticism — very rare with Chambers — in the course of which he voices his impression that the Jacobean tragedies 'are not without evidence of mental strain and sometimes exhaustion', (p. 86) that 'Shakespeare's spirit must have been nearly submerged in *Lear*', that 'he rose to his height of poetic expression in *Antony and Cleopatra*', and that 'the transition from the tragedies to the romances is not an evolution but a revolution', leads the author to the conclusion that 'there has been some mental process such as the psychology of religion would call a conversion'. In the same breath he refuses to dismiss, with Sir Sidney Lee, as idle gossip the statement of Richard Davies, a Gloucestershire clergyman of the end of the seventeenth century, that Shakespeare 'dyed a papist'. Surely, many a mere imaginative biographer or aesthetic critic would boggle at the startling and far-reaching conclusions which, on the strength of slender facts and generalizing psychological interpretation, are here with unmistakable implication drawn by Sir Edmund.

The fourth chapter deals with that part of the problem of transmission which centres round the book of the play, that is the authoritative stage-copy, in Elizabethan days often referred to as 'the book', and not necessarily identical with the 'original' or 'papers' which were handed in by the author. In this connection the author discusses, more briefly than in his *Elizabethan Stage*, the question of the censorship. The operations of the book-keeper, who had to prepare the manuscript for actual performance, are set forth, and the purpose of the 'plot' (a skeleton outline of the action) is explained.

Chapter V is headed 'The Quartos and the First Folio'. The Folio is



described, and Ben Jonson's possible authorship of the whole or part of the epistle to the readers, purported to be written by the publishers, is mentioned. One could have wished for the reasons why Chambers prefers Jonson's claims, first advanced by Steevens, to those of Prof. Pollard's candidate Blount. With regard to the nature of the copy handed in to Heminges and Condell, Chambers opposes both the doctrines of multiplied transcripts, adhered to by Sir Sidney Lee, and of 'continuous copy', which Professor Dover Wilson believes in. The first would seriously diminish the textual authority of the quartos, the second would involve serious and increasing inconvenience at every revival. Unlike Sir Sidney Lee, Chambers, in part basing himself on the publishers' statement that they scarce had 'received from him a blot in his papers', is quite willing to believe that at least some Q. and F. texts were set up from Shakespeare's autographs. He is reluctant to sanction Malone's theory supported by Dover Wilson, that in case of loss of prompt-copy, the various actors' parts were assembled and, with the aid of the 'plot', made fresh copy for the printers. 'One would suppose', says Sir Edmund, 'that both parts and plot, if preserved, would be kept with the prompt-copy, and that the loss of one would mean the loss of all.' This argument seems to me lacking in imagination, as also does that concerning gag, which Dover Wilson considers more likely to have got into parts than into prompt-copy, a differentiation which Chambers cannot bring himself to make. The theories of reporting plays from memory and of shorthand reporting, both of which procedures would account for many instances of textual corruption in the bad quartos, are considered at some length. Two generalizations, says Chambers, emerge from a comparison of the fourteen Good Quarto texts with their Folio counterparts. 'The first is that, in spite of the apparent wholesale repudiation of the Quartos by Heminges and Condell, nearly all the Folio texts were in fact set up from examples of the Quartos.....' The second generalization is 'that most and probably all of the reprinted texts have undergone some modification beyond what can be attributed to the compositors'. But to what a depressing extent the whole question is still involved in obscurity appears from the fact that on such an important point as the use of printed texts as prompt-copy no satisfactory evidence can be adduced.

The Chapter on 'Plays in the Printing-house' deals largely with the technique of Elizabethan printing, and with the possibility of involuntary or voluntary changes introduced into the texts by the hand of the compositor. Dover Wilson's dangerous dictum that 'when anything is wrong with the text, the blame should be laid rather on the copy than on the compositor', is scornfully refuted. The discussion on compositors' lapses through relying on auditory rather than visual representations, or the effect of past or coming words on the consciousness, or of simple fatigue, makes one wonder if in this particular department of research the help of modern psychology might not with advantage be called in. 'The human mind is a fallible instrument', says Chambers. But its fallacies are becoming more and more recognizable and capable of systematization. That is why a psychologist's study of parallel texts might throw valuable light on some points deemed obscure. Departures made at the printing-house from the originals in the matter of spelling, elision, punctuation and capitalization are all dealt with. The chaotic state of 16th century orthography in which 'many vowel sounds could be represented by a single vowel, a double vowel, or a diphthong' (*sic*) is called to mind. The author's horror of unnecessary elisions leads him to a most original and hitherto unsuspected interpretation of the line in *Hamlet* (III, 2, I) where the

prince warns the actors to speak 'trippingly on the tongue', which can only mean — thus explains Sir Edmund — 'not to slur the trisyllables.' While on the subject of punctuation, Chambers deals a slashing blow at the system adopted by the editors of the New Cambridge Shakespeare: 'Professor Wilson disfigures his own text by introducing a new punctuation, largely composed of dots and dashes, like a feminine novel.' (To the reviewer this, as well as the practice of interpolating arbitrary stage-directions into the text, has from the first been a pet aversion).

With Chapter VII, 'The Problem of Authenticity', we are in the thick of controversial issues. Chambers's position is summed up in the sentence: 'Nevertheless the Folio must be regarded as the chief authority for the main range of Shakespeare's dramatic responsibility, and it requires deference as coming from men who were in the best position to know the facts.' (p. 207). This is directly opposed to the conclusions that Mr. J. M. Robertson has come to, when he says that 'the great majority are simply not of Shakespeare's drafting.'<sup>1</sup> Towards this heresy Chambers adopts an attitude which is just the least little bit reminiscent of Samuel Johnson's on the occasion of a discussion on free will at the Club: 'Sir, we know our will is free, and there's an end of it. You are surer that you can lift up your finger or not as you please than you are of any conclusion from a deduction of reasoning.' Does not Chambers reply to the above statement by Robertson, 'After all, we have read the plays for ourselves, and have learnt to recognize in them, through all their diversities, a continuous personality, of which style is only one aspect. A single mind and a single hand dominate them.' This, it appears to me, is rather a conclusion than a starting-point for an argument. Chambers by no means rejects the study of style as a finger-print method for determining authorship: 'it enables one, for instance, to dismiss some of the apocryphal plays ascribed to Shakespeare without more ado.' (p. 220). But at the same time 'it is illegitimate to follow Mr. Robertson in expanding the canon by adding first one anonymous play, and then on the basis of this another, and then again another.' Clearly the author here allows himself greater freedom in the exercise of his acquired sense of style than he is prepared to concede to his opponent. But Chambers is undoubtedly right when he observes that there is no way of getting at the characteristics of an individual writer, except from work of which his authorship is acknowledged.' (p. 220). He has many a wise word to say on the danger of the attempts to determine authorship by the citation of parallels. He is extremely cautious with regard to theories of revision and collaboration, although he admits the occurrence of these practices. At this point he crosses swords with Prof. Dover Wilson, who, according to Chambers, is often too hot on the scent of a revision to consider alternative explanations, for instance in the matter of broken lines or lost threads. The latter are explained away by Chambers as examples of Shakespeare's carelessness, or else as deliberate dramatic devices to produce an effect of solidity, 'as if life were passing on all the time behind the stage.' (p. 231). One would like to hear which of the two — diametrically opposed — viewpoints the author takes up in dealing with each special instance of lost threads. His case appears to me much stronger when he defends against the revision theory prose lines that can be scanned as verse. He makes a very good point in citing from *As You Like It* (IV, i, 30):

1 J. M. Robertson, *The Shakespeare Canon*, Part III, p. 200.

*Orl.* Good day, and happiness, dear Rosalind !

*Jaq.* Nay then, God be wi' you, an you talk in blank verse.

These lines prove, as Chambers remarks, that Shakespeare was not unconscious of the device.

The starting-point of Chambers's approach to the problem of chronology is 'a recognition of the substantial homogeneity of most of the plays.' (p. 244). The author's scepticism is again apparent in the reluctance with which he is prepared to avail himself of historical allusions in the plays as a means of fixing their date. 'Shakespeare does not seem to have been greatly given to 'topical' allusions, and the hunt for them becomes dangerous, especially if it is inspired by a desire to link the plays with contemporary literary controversies in which he may have taken but little interest, or with incidents in the chequered careers of the Earls of Southampton and Essex, revealed to us by the ransacking of political archives, but of doubtful familiarity to the Elizabethan populace or its playwrights.' (p. 246). The latter part of this sentence seems to me to put the matter completely upside down: it is surely more natural to argue that incidents were known to the Elizabethan populace and its playwrights for which we have to ransack archives to become familiar with them. — To literary and psychological analysis of the plays as a means of affixing a date to them, Chambers attaches but little value. This can only follow, not precede the establishment of a chronology, he says (p. 252). But is this so? Suppose that to a future generation the chronology of Mr. Shaw's work was uncertain, would not a literary and psychological analysis of *St. Joan* go very far to prove that it is a later play than, say, *Man and Superman*?

Very interesting are the pages in which Chambers deals with verse-tests. Unlike Professor König, he believes that such words as 'heaven', 'devil', 'spirit', 'fire' at the end of a line, where the line-break leaves room for an open utterance, are disyllabic. 'On the other hand, I do not feel that word-endings in *-ion* and *-ious*, although these are also sometimes treated as disyllabic in the mid-verse at any rate of the earlier plays, make double endings.' (p. 261). This statement I must confess myself at a loss to understand. Who could conceivably assign a double ending to such lines as

So quick bright things some to confusion.

(*M.N.D.*, I, i, 149)

or

And mark the musical confusion

Of hounds and echo in conjunction.

(*M.N.D.*, IV, i, 111).

These lines were spoken in ten syllables or, far less probably, in nine: double endings are therefore, in either case, out of the question. The possibility of a feminine ending in such lines as

To be or not to be, that is the question

is, of course, a different matter.

The author finds himself constantly at variance with the scansion of foreign observers, and doubts whether they fully appreciate the incidence of English stress. I believe that Chambers is right here, although some foreigners may be apt to err more than others. The same complaint has been voiced by Prof. Saintsbury. It is, therefore, with more than usual diffidence that I venture to



disagree with Chambers on a small point of prosody. In the matter of enjambment (or 'overflow') elocutionary feeling must have the last word, says the author (on p. 263), and, again, the treatment of such cases as overflows is largely optional (p. 263). Though true in essence, this seems to me to overstate the case. Chambers' conception of an overflow and certainly of a necessary overflow is avowedly more restricted than that upon which Professors König and Conrad have based tables (p. 264). By way of illustration Chambers marks with one and two asterisks a number of lines from *The Tempest* in which overflow seems respectively optional and necessary. The first five lines are :

Ye elves of hills, brooks, standing lakes and groves,  
 \*And ye that on the sands with printless foot  
 \*Do chase the ebbing Neptune and do fly him  
 \*When he comes back; you demi-puppets that  
 By moonshine do the green sour ringlets make.....  
 (*Tempest*, V, i, 33—37.)

I imagine that most readers will agree about the enjambment at the end of the second and third lines being optional, but I wonder if many people can be found, in England or on the continent, who would be prepared to look upon the enjambment in the fourth line as anything else than most strictly necessary. I really do not think that the matter of enjambment is as subjective as all that.

Chapter IX, by far the longest, discusses separately the plays of the First Folio. In these discussions the views, theories, convictions and conclusions expounded in the preceding chapters are brought to bear on each individual play. For a specimen of the author's method in dealing with the textual history of a play his argument in favour of *Q<sub>2</sub> Hamlet* will serve.

Chapter X deals in like manner with the plays outside the first folio, and chapter XI with the poems and sonnets. As alluded to above, Chambers favours Herbert as the young man to whom the sonnets were dedicated. 'If we are to look in the ranks of the higher nobility, it is Herbert, rather than Southampton, who affords the most plausible identification for Shakespeare's friend. I am not clear that the conditions might not be satisfied by some young man of good birth and breeding, but of less degree than an earl. But I have no candidate to propose.' (p. 567). Some space is devoted to the poem *Willobie his Avisa*. I wonder if further study of this poem might not eventually throw more light on the veiled personal experiences in the Sonnets.

The second volume consists of appendices giving records of the life, contemporary allusions, Shakespeare myths, performances of plays, the name Shakespeare, Shakespearean fabrications, a table of quartos, metrical tables, a list of books, and a subject-index.

It would be easy to supply the reader with further information on Chambers's book. But the foregoing remarks already take up more space than is generally available for an ordinary book review. My excuse must be that Sir Edmund has written no ordinary book. *William Shakespeare, a Study of Facts and Problems*, is the ultimate crystallisation of the unremitted labour of many years, based principally on the patient collecting, critical sifting and judicious arranging of facts. That, in itself, would have made his book invaluable to any student of Shakespeare. But its pages are further illumined by the author's acute powers of analysis, his remarkable gift in building up or destroying a case with the sole aid of logic, and his unmistakable reverence for and love of the object of his researches. On more than one occasion Sir Edmund has

found it necessary to reassure (or warn) the reader that his is no work of aesthetic criticism. But his deep appreciation of the beauty and intuitive rapport with the spirit of Shakespeare's works is apparent on many a page. Only, it is hardly ever allowed to become the basis for, or even an aid to, an argument.

The Hague.

J. KOOISTRA.

*Studien zur Syntax in den Werken Geoffrey Chaucers.* I Teil. Von DR. FRITZ KARPf. — Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, herausgegeben von Karl Luick, LV. Band. Wilhelm Braumüller, Wien und Leipzig, 1930. XIV + 148 pp. Price RM. 8.

The death of Fritz Karpf, on the 8th of June 1932, means a serious loss to the study of English syntax. In spite of his weak health he was a devoted worker.

His Chaucer studies were begun in 1919 at Bruck an der Mur. Here he was handicapped by not having access to the necessary books and periodicals, and it was not till 1925, when he obtained the long-desired appointment at Graz that he could pursue his studies under comparatively favourable circumstances.

Karpf lived to publish only the first part of his work, in which the gender and the number of nouns, the article, the numeral, and comparison are dealt with, while there is also a chapter on congruence, and another on 'Ersparung', i.e. economy by suppression.

In the first chapter, on gender, the Author registers quite a number of interesting facts. He shows that *body*, when it means 'person', is masculine, while otherwise it is neuter, and that even *thing* = 'person' may be masculine. *Ship* is still neuter in Chaucer, *beggestere* and *lifestere* are already masculine; *messenger* is mostly masculine, but in two cases it is feminine. *Porter*, when it stands for *ydelnesse*, is feminine, and so are *theef* and *traytour*, when used to indicate *Fortune*. Even *wastour* occurs as a feminine. A number of nouns denoting persons, namely *lemman*, *love*, *make*, *shrewe*, *sovereyn*, and *spouse*, may be either masculine or feminine, while *harlot* is always masculine.

As to *lemman* < *leofman*, the Author remarks that it is not recorded in Old English. Yet the word certainly existed in Old English; in *The Place Names of Worcestershire* p. 397 the name *Leommanningsweg* is quoted from a 10th century document.

On p. 14 ff. the gender of certain groups of nouns is treated in detail, namely nouns denoting animals, plants, stones, parts of the body, places, celestial bodies, periods of time, nature and natural phenomena, life and death, virtues and vices, sciences, actions of the mind, emotions, and abstractions.

The following valuable remarks have been translated from the summary concluding the first chapter. "The ascription of personal gender to inanimate things in Chaucer is due in far and away the greatest number of cases to external circumstances, such as the gender of the foreign word in the non-English source, ancient and medieval allegories and personifications, the influence of identity, and the Middle English tendency to make nouns masculine. In this Chaucer does not go appreciably beyond the general

Middle English practice in so far as it depended upon such external circumstances..... It is impossible to say positively in each particular case whether in the interchange (or the transition) of the impersonal and (to) the personal gender there is a conscious poetical purpose, and what purpose may be at the bottom of Chaucer's occasional deviations from his source."

The first part of the second chapter is taken up by a discussion of various groups of nouns that either regularly or under certain circumstances have the same form in the plural as in the singular, as names of measures (*fadom, fot, furlong, last, yeer, wynter, night, month, myle*), names of coins, and names of certain animals (*deer, hors, neet, sheep, swyn, fish, foul*). Romance plurals like *aas, ches, caas, deys, trespas, vers*, etc. only seem to be endless. It is worth noting that the plural *things* is already far more usual in Chaucer than the old plural *thing*. *Maner* may be either an old plural, or an old genitive, not only in *al maner (of)*, but also in other cases. *Tyme, part, deel, fold*, which may have a plural meaning, have, according to Karpf, been influenced by *sithe* < O.E. *siðum*.

On p. 31 the Author states that the plural *poundes* (monetary unit) first occurs in 1380 (Wyclif). There is a much older instance in the *Worcester Fragment C*, 5, *hwat beoþ nu þe pundes þurh [pa]newes igædered* (date c. 1180).

In a short section on the plural of proper names it is pointed out that Chaucer only pluralizes proper names, if they are used to typify and characterize certain persons (*any Judas; a Salomon*). Examples of the plurals *Herodes* and *Grisildes* are given.

Chaucer does not use the so-called editorial plural, not even in his translation of Boethius, although it occurs frequently in the original. In the same translation, however, he does use the plural of majesty.

For an early instance of the plural of majesty the Author refers to *Floriz and Blauncheflur* (line 64). Unfortunately this line is only found in the Trentham MS., which is late (c. 1440). It would have been better to say that very early (the earliest?) examples occur in the *Proclamation* of 1258 (*we* 5 times, *us* 3 times, *ure* 8 times).

The section on the plural used in English, if the possession belongs to more than one possessor (*They turned up their noses at it. Several people lost their lives*) contains a wealth of detail, showing that in the main Chaucer's practice agrees with the rule observed in present-day English, though Chaucer sometimes uses the plural where it would not be tolerated now, and, conversely, there are also cases in which he adheres to the old, common Germanic, usage.

The exigencies of rhyme and metre probably have a good deal to do with these deviations. Strange to say Chaucer occasionally employs the plural where his Latin original has a singular (p. 39). Karpf merely states this fact without comment. One cannot help asking why Chaucer was more consistent here than the Latin text he was translating. In writing *Ye threste adoun your dignitees* he probably did what he felt to be the right thing. This is significant, as an indication of the stage the transition from the singular to the plural had reached in Chaucer's English.

The unique position Middle English gradually came to occupy among the Germanic languages as regards the use of the plural in the above case, Karpf puts down to Latin and French influence, although he states that already in Old-English the plural is found (p. 37). Assertions of this kind are always



difficult to prove, if grammatical facts and functions are concerned that constitute a specific feature of a language. In the case of phrases and idioms it is generally easy enough to furnish conclusive evidence. Why should spontaneous development *a priori* be excluded here? In Middle English the general trend certainly does seem to be in the direction of what might be called logicity of expression. Anyhow, if foreign influences were at work in this particular case, they must have begun to make themselves felt at an early date. There are several instances of the plural, instead of the singular, in the *Lambeth Homilies*, *Lazamon*, *Orm*, etc.

A separate section is devoted to the use of *ye*, *yow*, by the side of *thou*, *the*, in addressing one person. The Author shows that *thou* is used: firstly, in addressing God, the Virgin Mary, heathen gods, and persons of higher rank; secondly, among relations and other persons who are on terms of intimacy, among people of the same social standing, and further when the poet addresses the reader, or a person acting a part in his story; thirdly when a person of a socially lower rank is addressed, or when a more or less contemptuous tone is adopted. *Ye*, on the other hand, is used in the courteous form of address, if a person of a socially higher position is spoken to. The discrimination between *thou* and *ye* is, however, by no means carried through consistently; Karpf gives some striking examples of both pronouns occurring in the same passage. In some cases Chaucer may have had a reason for first using the one, and then the other; in other cases there seems to be no reason whatever for his passing from *thou* to *ye*, and conversely.

In this section the Author once more refers to *Floriz and Blauncheflur* to illustrate pre-Chaucerian usage. In this text *thou* is used throughout, except in four cases in which *ze* is employed; but here again the fact is overlooked that these four instances all occur in the late Trentham MS.. Early examples of *ze* might have been given from *Robert of Gloucester*, from *King Horn* (C, O, and L), from *Guy of Warwick* (early version), *Sir Tristrem*, and *Arthur and Merlin*, the last three from the Auchinleck MS..

In the last section of the second chapter it is shown that *the better of the two*, a construction that owes its origin to Latin influence, is more usual in Chaucer than *the best of the two*.

On reading the long chapter on the Article one comes to the conclusion that in most respects the rules observed in present-day English, already held good in Chaucer's time. As might be expected, the absence or the presence of the article is sometimes due entirely to metrical reasons. With one exception, names of rivers are not preceded by the definite article; the exception, *the Poo*, must, according to Karpf, be accounted for on metrical grounds.

The Author attributes the absence of the definite article before *holy chirche* to the circumstance that *holy chirche* is regarded as a unique (p. 57). OE. *halge cirice* is, so far as I know, always preceded by the definite article; for instances see e.g. *Past.* C. 97.7; 114.8 and 17; *Blickl. Hom.* pp. 11, 75 and 77. Anglo-Norman *seint(e) eglise*, on the other hand, is never used with the definite article, so that imitation of the A. N. practice may have led to the suppression of the article in Middle English. Instances of *holi chirche* are found as early as the latter part of the twelfth century.

What Karpf calls the concretizing use of the indefinite article (to be in a hurry) is of frequent occurrence in Chaucer, but Chaucer's practice is sometimes at variance with what is nowadays called good grammar. With *pitee*, *routhe* the article is seldom found, while Chaucer has *have a leyser* (by the

side of *have leyser*), *doon a reverence to, the clappe of a thundringe*. In standing phrases the article is generally suppressed; a large number of such phrases consisting of *doon, maken, han, taken, given, beren*, or some other verb + object or adjunct, is exemplified on pp. 71-79.

The use of the indefinite article with *ende* forms the subject of a separate section, in reality a discussion of the origin of Chaucer's *at an ende*. Einkenkel traced it back long ago to O.E. *æt þam ende*, which became *atten ende*, and then, through sandhi, *at an ende*. Karpf thinks that originally the definite article was logically required here, and quotes parallel passages from Middle High German texts, and points out that in Old French, too, the indefinite article is used before *fin*, though he owns that *sumne ende* (acc.) in Orosius shows that the indefinite article could be used in O.E., and further calls attention to Modern English *to be at an end*. Chaucer has not only *be at an ende*, but also *bringen (dryven) to an ende, han an ende, maken an ende*, and *at (atte) ende*. Karpf comes to the conclusion that phonetically Einkenkel's explanation cannot be accepted without reserve, although the question cannot be settled until all the material is available, and considers it likely that on the analogy of *to an end, have an end*, and also owing to metrical factors (*my tale is at ende* is metrically impossible), the indefinite article found its way into *at ende, atten ende*, both from *æt þam ende*.

I do not think the phonetical difficulty is a serious one. The M.E. representative of O.E. *at þam (þam) ende* was probably pronounced as if it was one word; cf. the spelling *atenende* in *Legends Holy Rood* II, 28, Ashm. MS.; *Bev. of Hamt.*, Auch. MS. 3457; *Ayenb.* 128. The *n* might be taken to belong either to the first half (*aten ende, Lutel Soth Sermon* 91) or to the second (*atte nende, Iacob and Iosep* 327). Hence we find in Robert of Gloucester's *Chronicle*: *attenende* (3457), *atten ende* (789 and 7794), and *atte nende* (763 and 943). Phonetically there can have been little, if any, difference between *at(t)en ende* and *at an ende*.

As to *at (atte) ende* the Author asks, "Fehlen des Artikels oder *at aus atte* mit Verschleifung des *e*?" *At ende*, which is also found elsewhere (*Curs. M.* 14879 C and G; *Tristrem* 407), might, of course, have developed from *atte ende*; probably, however, it is simply O.E. *æt ende* (*Exodus* 128 and 466; *Judith* 272; *O.E. Chron.* 998 E, etc.).

*At ende* can hardly have descended from *æt þam ende*. On p. 69 Karpf remarks that the development of *æt þam* into *atte* requires further investigation. It seems to me that *atte* has nothing whatever to do with *æt þam*, which is *at ten* in M.E.<sup>1</sup>; cf. *at ter* < *æt þære*; it is *at* + *þe*. *Þe* (the modern definite article), which has always been indifferent as to gender, number, and case, is almost consistently employed in the last portion of the *Peterborough Chronicle* (the EMS.). After *t* and *d þe* became *te*: 1132 *and te king; þat te king*, etc. (frequently). Accordingly we also find 1131 *æt te forme slæp*; 1135 *æt te Lammasse* (feminine!); 1138 *at te Standard*. If *þe* (*te*) had developed from *þam (þam)*, þone the final nasal would have been preserved before a vowel; *þe* (*te*), however, is found before vowels just as well as before consonants: 1140 *for þe eorl; to þe eorl; and te eorl* (accusative), twice.

The chapter on numerals opens with a discussion of a few periphrases, such as *twelf..... and tweye, fourteen and an, thryes three, twyes twelve*, etc.; they

<sup>1</sup> Found only in the dialects of the South (and South Midlands?), in other words in those dialects which preserve *þen* < OE. *þæm* (and *þone*).

are all evidently due to the requirements of metre and rhyme. To indicate a small, indefinite number Chaucer uses *oon* or *two*....., a word or *two*, a day or *tweye*, etc., but also *oon*, or *two*, or *three*, a *yeer* or *two*, or *three*; a larger indefinite number is always indicated by *twenty*. The multiplicatives are much the same as in present-day English. The Author gives two instances of a cardinal number + *so* (*two so*, *ten so*, 'twice as', 'ten times as') also found in O.E. Chaucer uses *thrye*, *thryes*, and *tymes three*; in the case of larger numbers he employs either a cardinal number followed by *sythe*, or *tymes*, which may be either preceded or followed by a cardinal number.

That *thrye* is used, as the Author observes, if the rhyme requires it, is, of course, quite true, but it should be remembered that *thrye* is the older form, to which an 'adverbial' *s* was added.

The next chapter, dealing with comparison, is a valuable contribution to Middle English syntax. What Karpfs calls 'indirect comparison' is expressed in two ways: *a*, *There is no man so proud as he*; *b*, *There is no man prouder than he*. Both types are found in Old English and in Old French, and also in Middle English. It is remarkable that Chaucer shows a great predilection for the *a* type; the *b* type is comparatively rare. The *a* type of indirect comparison is also expressed by means of the noun *peer* (*Of wrastling was ther noon his peer*), and by *half so* (*For instrument ne melodye Was nowher herd yet half so swete*). — The elative, which has the function of indicating a high degree of a quality, is expressed by adverbs of degree, most frequently by *ful*. The statistics on p. 91 show that *ful* is used in 68 per cent. of the cases examined; *right* is found 14 times out of every 100; *wel* ranks third (7 %); *ynough*, *sore*, *wonder*, *wonderly*, *verray*, *ful wonder* only occur occasionally. — On p. 92 ff. the Author comments on the vexed question as to what is the exact meaning of *for* before adjectives. The conclusion arrived at is, briefly, that *for* may be either an intensive (*for-old*, *forfered*, etc.), or a preposition meaning 'on account of' (*a man*..... *May nought endure on it to see for brighte*). — The section on the elative is concluded with instances of a few further elative devices used by Chaucer, as: *with the beste*; *never so* (only in concessive clauses); and as especially in *as swythe*, 'as quickly as possible'; only one instance of *as faste* is given. — Chaucer sometimes expresses comparison by other means than the degrees of comparison, namely by *croune of*, *flour of*, *sours of*, *welle of* (*fons et origo*), etc. — The Hebrew superlative construction *king of kinges*, *all floures flour*, like above (*over*) *alle thinges*, and allied constructions, were introduced into English through Church Latin. — Instead of the superlative we often find the adjectives *cheef* and *sovereyn* (as in Modern English), or the verb *passen* is used to periphrase the superlative (The attributive present participle *passing*, 'extreme' (passing crueltee) is not mentioned!). — The equative is generally denoted by *as*..... *as*, but also by constructions like *ther was noon her liche*. A gradual increase of a quality is expressed in three ways: *a*, by means of *alwey* (*ever*, *ay*) + comparative or verb (Germanic); *b*, by repeating the comparative: *more and more*, *ner and ner* (Romance); *c*, by a combination of the Germanic and the Romance type: *ever bet and bet*; *ay more and more*. — As regards the use of the ..... *the* (*the sooner the better*) Chaucer's English is quite modern, except in that he frequently intensifies the first comparative by placing *ay* before it: *And ay the neer he was, the more he brende*.

The sixth chapter, the longest but one, deals with congruence. It first brings a discussion of a peculiarity of the English language, already found in Old



English, and still living on in Modern English, namely the practice of expressing the same ideas twice, in Chaucer mostly by a Germanic and a synonymous Romance word, connected by *and*. In *Boethius* such doublets are met with in great numbers; they often render one Latin word. If the subject consists of two nouns connected by *and*, the verb is generally in the singular in *Boethius*; the singular is at least six times as frequent as the plural. The combination of a double subject with a singular verb is, however, found elsewhere in Chaucer too; examples from the *Canterbury Tales* are given on p. 105. — Another noteworthy feature of Chaucer's syntax is that if the predicate precedes the subject, it is generally in the singular, also if the subject is a noun in the plural, or if it consists of two or more singular nouns, no matter whether they are connected by *and* or not. Examples like *Ther were a doseyn in that hous* are comparatively rare in Chaucer. Even if the verb follows the subject, it is mostly in the singular, if the subject consists of two or more singular nouns, not connected by *and*: *His sleep, his mete, his drink is him biraft*. If, however, the elements of the subject are connected by *and*, Chaucer only puts the verb in the singular, if the components are the names of abstractions; in the case of concretes the verb is mostly in the plural; in the case of names of persons it practically always is. If the nouns are joined by *and eek*, or *and also*, the verb is mostly in the singular. Also if the connection is established by *both ..... and*, the verb is in the singular, except in the case of names of persons. The disjunctive *or*, placed between the components of the subject, of course, singularizes the verb, and so do *neither ..... nor*, and *ne ..... ne*, although in the latter case the predicate is occasionally in the plural. In Modern English the predicate is mostly in the singular, if it belongs to a subject like *John with his wife*; this holds good of Chaucer's English as well. Collectives (pp. 114-124) sometimes have a singular, sometimes a plural predicate, very much the same as in present-day English.

The last chapter is concerned with the cases in which Chaucer suppresses the verb or the subject. Although not all the examples given, if modernized, would be good English now, parallels may be found in several cases in present-day, or in Early Modern English.

The above summary will, I trust, give an idea of the importance of Dr. Karpf's book, which, though not everything in it is new, for the first time systematically, and with adequate fulness of detail, gives a picture of certain aspects of the structure of Chaucer's English.

It is to be hoped that the second volume, which according to a statement in the Preface to the first volume, was in an advanced stage of preparation in March 1930, will not remain unpublished.

Amsterdam.

W. VAN DER GAAF.

*The Universal English Dictionary*, edited by HENRY CECIL WYLD.  
London, George Routledge & Sons, 1932. XX+1417 pp. 42/— net.

This is not only a large, but also a great book: though neither so large nor so great as the Oxford Dictionary, it is sure to be considered for many years to come a standard work of reference, which will be consulted with profit and pleasure by scholars and laymen alike. It is not like Funk-Wagnall's and other

recent books an encyclopedic dictionary in which one can find the date of McKinley's birth and the height of the mountain called after him, but in compensation it gives much more space to what should be the proper task of a dictionary, the words themselves and their actual use in speech and writing. The type is clear, and the editor has treated the thousands of matters dealt with in such a way that it is a delight to follow him and to benefit from his vast stores of learning.

Professor Wyld is well-known as an accomplished phonetician and as such has naturally paid much attention to pronunciation. Students of phonetics will often consult that part of his transcriptions in which he has used the same exact system as in his works on the history of English; but for the use of those who are deterred by phonetic script there is everywhere also a more popular transcription which the average Englishman will understand at a glance without any previous study. The pronunciation given is "Received Standard English", i.e. Southern English; and it is very likely that many readers in Great Britain no less than in America, will resent some things, for instance, the uniform transcription of *wh* as *w*. In matters of pronunciation it is of course impossible to satisfy everyone, but by means of his double system Professor Wyld has probably gone as far in this direction as is compatible with a scholarly conscience. In many cases alternative pronunciations have been indicated. Under *forehead* we find no less than three pronunciations, which I transcribe in my own way as [fɔrid, fɔred, fɔ'hed], the last marked "vulgar or modern". In the analogous case of *waistcoat* the forms [weskət] and [weis(t)kout] are given without comment. It is interesting to see how often the vowel [ɔ'] is given in the phonetic transcription where the spelling has *-ure* and the popular transcription has *ūr*: *mature*, *insure*, *fury*, *futurity*, *purist*; both [jɔ] and [juə] are indicated for *sure*, *pure*, *obscure*. No pronunciation is given for the learned plural *fungi*. *Formerly* and *formally* are evidently identical in sound to the author.

One of the distinctive features of this Dictionary is the great space given to etymology, and on the whole this part of the work is admirable. The author has shown much discrimination in selecting all that is reliable in recent etymological investigations without bewildering the reader, as some etymological dictionaries do, with a great many fanciful proposals that have found their way to linguistic periodicals. Provided they are tolerably certain, even far-off cognates are mentioned, thus under *care*, where 16 lines are devoted to etymology, we are told about Gr. *barús*, Lat. *brutus*, an Umbrian form, &c; under *paradise* much is said about the latter part of the Avestan word from which it is borrowed, with reference to *fiction* and *dough*, which few readers have probably associated with *paradise*. The word *crinite*, from the English point of view certainly one of the most unimportant words, receives nine lines of etymology to half a line of definition. Under *file* III (device for keeping papers together) it was perhaps scarcely necessary after noting Lat. *filum* and the corresponding Lith., OPrussian and OSlav. forms to add, "It is possible that Lat. *funis*, 'rope, line, cord', is fr. another form of same base, w. different suff. See *funicular*." But why grumble if a man who gives us so much excellent information seems here and there to give us a little too much?

Sometimes Wyld seems unduly sceptical: some prominent scholars still think it possible to maintain the connexion between *have* and Lat. *habere*, which he denies; under *see* he says that connexion with Lat. *sequor* is now abandoned, but see Feist, Boisag and others (cf. also my own *Language*, p. 306). In many

cases where Wyld says "etym. unknown" I should say "echoism" or "imitative". Skeat's explanation of *tiny* is ignored, and so is my own of *pet*, which was given many years ago in one inconspicuous line in *Growth and Str.* § 173: I think it is simply a back-formation from *petty* (Fr. *petit*), just as *cad* is from *caddy* (Fr. *cadet*): from *petty dog* 'little dog' the transition is easy to the meaning 'favourite, cherished dog' and thence to *pet dog*; thus also *my pet theory* from 'my (dear) little theory', &c. Another theory of mine has also been overlooked: the ending *-ster* is still said to have been in OE. restricted to feminine nouns, though I think I have demonstrated that from the beginning it was applied to both sexes (MLR XXII, p. 129 ff., April 1927).

The Dictionary gives very few quotations, but a most valuable feature is the abundance of good idiomatic everyday phrases given throughout. In the Preface it is said that "The Editor has not hesitated to include words and idioms which belong to current slang": one might wish he had included even more of this class, which is so characteristic a trait in much modern literature. He further says that "The work of defining and mapping out the meanings of each word was carried out, in the first instance, independently of other dictionaries", and it must be admitted that this has generally been done very carefully and with great skill. Nevertheless, some of the definitions are not satisfactory. The *infinitive* is said to be "that form of a verb which denotes action or existence without limitation of person, number or tense": what about the perfect inf. in English and Latin or about the personal inflexion of the inf. in Portuguese and other languages? *Boat* is defined:

Hollow receptacle, whose essential property is that it floats in water and sustains a considerable weight..... a generic term for water-craft of every description, large or small, whether used on the sea, on rivers or lakes, and no matter how propelled, whether by oars, a single paddle, a pole, steam or internal combustion engine, or electricity.

Here the Concise Oxford is much better:

Small open oared or sailing vessel, fishing vessel, mail packet, or small steamer.

*Boat-train*, too, is better explained in the Conc. O.D. than by Wyld.

One more cavilling remark, and I have done. *Chamber* (5) "Euphemistic for a domestic utensil, for chamber-pot". No, the euphemism, if euphemism it can be called, is in the full expression *chamber-pot*; but *chamber* for this compound is to be compared with such shortenings as *canary* for *canary bird*, *straw* for *straw hat*, &c.

In spite of some criticism the readers of this review will have received the general impression that I am full of admiration for this new Dictionary.

Gentofte, Copenhagen.

OTTO JESPERSEN.

*An Outline of English Phonetics.* By DANIEL JONES. Third Edition (rewritten). X + 326 pp. Leipzig, Teubner, 1932. M. 7.80.

It has been a pleasure to me to peruse this handbook with a view to expressing my opinion on it. For this reason I prefer to mention the few



objections I have, before pointing out its many signal qualities. Professor Jones, in accordance with the present tendency, uses a more learned terminology than seems at all requisite. In reading the *t* described as an *alveolar plosive consonant* I sorely regretted this substitution for Sweet's no less clear term *gum stop*. And when by way of exception the author strives after simplicity in this respect I cannot admire the result: 'the *fronter* and *backer* members of the phoneme *k*' does not sound very euphonic. (Neither do I think the necessity of Anglicizing 'timbre' by spelling it 'tamber' very urgent.) In keeping with this rather unwieldy terminology is a certain fondness of enumerations and divisions, reminding the reader of the German fashion of treating similar subjects. On p. 2 *six difficulties of pronunciation* are distinguished, in their turn followed by a number of sections telling the reader how to surmount each of them. Besides, at least one of them is greatly exaggerated, viz. the difficulty of the proper sequences, i.e. the order in which the sounds of a certain word are to be emitted, which is more of the nature of a psychical process. In the same way *six types of similitude* and *six of assimilation* are mentioned on pp. 204-205, each group accompanied by a formula running (in the case of similitude): 'The subsidiary sound B belonging to the phoneme whose principal member is the sound A is used when the sound C precedes (or follows)', which looks rather forbidding without the redeeming feature of being enlightening. Moreover, is it necessary for practical purposes to introduce this new term *similitude* (referring to the pronunciation of the second consonants in words like *inhabit*, *snail*), which to a great extent applies to cases usually treated as *partial assimilation*? — Another illustration of the introduction of new distinctions that in my opinion are not indispensable is the conception *diaphone*, the different members of which are found in comparing the speech of one person with that of another (e.g. the vowel of *bone* as pronounced by a Londoner or a Scotchman), or in comparing two styles of speech of the same person (rolled *r* when declaiming, unrolled *r* in conversation.)

All these remarks, however, concern questions of secondary importance: they do not detract from the intrinsic value of the book. This *Outline of English Phonetics* may safely be called the standard work on the subject, its two outstanding qualities being completeness and thoroughness, without the drawback of overcrowding: the discussion of dialectical differences and foreign mistakes never unduly distracts the student's attention. It abounds in observations that convince the reader of the author's exceptionally long and wide experience in teaching phonetics, which is also evident from its practical arrangement and the very useful hints it contains for foreigners, especially Frenchmen, Germans, Scandinavians, Portuguese and Spaniards, rarely Dutchmen. It stands to reason that not all of these are new, but they bear repetition e.g. § 765: 'The use of the uvular rolled *r* or uvular fricative *r* is one of the commonest and most objectionable mistakes made by foreigners in pronouncing English.' Equally practical is the author, when he sometimes sacrifices scientific correctness in teaching, cf. p. 96: 'For the purpose of practical language teaching it is convenient to regard a diphthong as a succession of two vowels, in spite of the fact, that, strictly speaking, it is a gliding sound'. Nor does he occasionally refrain from giving the opinion of others, even though he does not agree with it, e.g. when he mentions the terms *tenseness* and *laxness*, but states that they 'probably do not describe accurately the action of the tongue in differentiating certain vowels'. — It is also

gratifying in a handbook on the theory of pronunciation to read the following statements, showing that the author is fully aware of the limits of such knowledge: 'the learner of a foreign language should begin his study by ear-training' or 'the acquisition of a spoken language is essentially an oral process.' He likewise recognizes the relative usefulness of diagrams, though there are more than a hundred inserted in the text, when he says: 'The finer adjustments of the tongue in learning vowels have to be done by means of sensory control from the ear.' It will have been for similar reasons that in this third edition the author has only sparingly referred to experimental phonetics.

As a proof that the rewriting has been done very carefully I may adduce what Professor Jones says about the relative pronoun *that*, of which he now gives a strong form as well, though in his *English Pronouncing Dictionary*, reprinted in 1930, it still says that this pronoun has *weak forms* only, (cf. Mr. Eykman in the June number of *De Drie Talen*, 1932, who gives a good example of the relative ðæt: 'James..... arranged the books that, in spite of poverty, Mr. John had managed to collect.') Equally noteworthy is the author's distinction between *objective* and *subjective impression* as far as stress is concerned, found on p. 227 in a footnote: When a strong force of exhalation fails there is no objective impression of *loudness*. So if in *thank you* the first three sounds are not pronounced there is a strong stress on the first (syllabic) *k*. 'A hearer familiar with the language would not perceive the stress objectively from the sound apart from the gestures, but he perceives it in a subjective way; the sounds he hears call up to his mind (through the context) the manner of making them, and by means of immediate 'inner speech' he knows where the stress is.' Another subject in the same chapter that has received adequate treatment is the stress on prepositions at the end of the sentence: many foreigners are apt to overstress them in cases such as: *What are you driving at?* On the other hand prepositions followed by pronouns are often understressed by the same sinners; against this mistake we find the warning: 'Foreigners should note that in these cases the preposition more usually has its strong form and has noticeably stronger stress than the pronoun', e.g. *What shall we do with it?* It is very tempting to go on giving quotations, but two more useful practical hints must suffice: 'Foreigners can often improve their pronunciation of words containing æ by lengthening the vowel,' e.g. *glad, man, jam, bag*. — Another improvement is to be obtained 'by dropping the ə wherever it may be omitted: ə<sup>1</sup>wei frm ð<sup>1</sup>siti, ai [d v<sup>1</sup>θɔ:t sou. The long succession of consonants arising in such exercises are not so difficult as they look.'

A few questions suggested themselves to me while reading: Is there a special reason why only in some cases the voiced consonants are said to have a weaker air-pressure than the corresponding breathed ones: for *g d b z* it is stated that the force of exhalation is weaker than for *k t p f*, but not for *v ð z*? — Secondly: Is not the note on p. 133 too absolute: 'Similarly the adverbs formed from participles take the pronunciation -idli, whatever the form of the simple participle may be': *unfeignedly, markedly, composedly*. What about: *goodnaturally, determinedly*, both occurring in the *Pronouncing Dictionary*, mentioned above, and *hurriedly, distinguishedly, astonishedly, embarrassedly*, given in the N.E.D.? — In the third place: Will a student, after reading § 580, have a clear notion how his ear gets the impression of the *p* in a word like *apt*, though there is only one explosion?

If I were asked to say which chapters have struck me as particularly good I should feel inclined to single out the one on *gradation* (how important a sound knowledge of this subject is may appear from the statement: 'The proper use of weak forms is essential for a correct pronunciation of English, and is one of the most difficult features of English pronunciation for foreigners to acquire'), and the last chapter on *intonation*, which is a marvel of a simple and clear discussion of a very difficult subject, the importance of which is likewise very great, because an un-English intonation may mar a foreigner's pronunciation that is passable in all other respects. — As the other chapters, however, also come up to a very high standard I feel justified in saying that any student who has thoroughly mastered the contents of this *Outline* (which is in reality a fairly complete handbook) will possess a sound knowledge of English Phonetics.

The Hague.

L. J. GUITTART.

### Brief Mention.

*Spiritualismus und Sensualismus in der Englischen Barocklyrik.*  
Von DR. WERNER P. FRIEDERICH. Wien und Leipzig, Braumüller,  
1932. Pp. viii — 303 (Wiener Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie  
LVII Band). RM. 14.

This book is a general account of the metaphysical poets, so copiously illustrated with quotations as to make of it almost an anthology arranged according to certain themes. Dr. Friederich's discussion of these latter shows him well read in the critical literature on the metaphysical school as well as on the whole period, but it does not contribute much to what we knew already on the subject. From what the author says on pp. 13-14 and elsewhere we may have been led to expect from him an illuminating comparison between the English metaphysical poets and the German Baroque poets. But the few quotations from Rist, Gryphius, Gesenius, do not bear out his contention that "die Formen der englischen Lyrik im allgemeinen weniger markant barock sind als die der deutschen Lyrik." The German passages are altogether far less sophisticated. We do not deny that the parallelism may exist: but it still waits for its illustrator.

The work is on the whole carefully printed, apart from occasional slips (as for instance the Italian quotation in footnote 33 on p. 286, where four misprints occur within five lines). As a preliminary introduction to the subject Dr. Friederich's book may prove useful to German students. — M. P.

### Errata in Vol. XIV (1932).

October number, p. 200, l. 10, for *primary* read *primarily*.

December number, p. 224, l. 5, read: *Abraham Cowley, sa Vie, son Œuvre*, etc.

Ibid., p. 237, l. 17 fr. bottom, read: this example, because it illustrates how difficult it is to argue about these

[The Bibliography will be brought up to date in the next issue.]



## The Letters of WALTER SCOTT.

It was unusual good fortune that provided Scott with the one biographer capable of presenting his life in the admirable light in which it had been seen by his friends. He has not had to suffer posthumously from the maladroitness or want of imagination of a Cockburn or a Froude. None of his literary contemporaries or successors with the exception of Dickens and George Eliot came off well. In the case of Thackeray his own shrinking sensitiveness to the blundering and fumbling with his tenderest affairs by some literary executor made him forbid the attempt, and for want of an authoritative story, his reputation was soon assailed by rumours and detraction which have not been fully dispelled to this day. Scott during his life had no enemies. The one note of hostility in his life was when the Reform Bill mob of Jedburgh surrounded his carriage with shouts of "Burk Sir Walter!" It was the intrusion of the new socialism on the old world of feudalism and on a true representative, the descendant of Border gentry and Tory laird of Abbotsford. He has had no detractors after his death, unless one excepts Carlyle, and even under Carlyle's indignation at Scott's lack of prophetic fire, one heard very clearly a profound admiration of the man that went far to mitigate his stricture of the poet. Lockhart's picture of Scott as a sort of quizzical and unromantic Prince Fortunatus has remained essentially intact these hundred years and it is only now, when by an act of very appropriate piety his letters have been published for the first time completely and in their original form, that one can test the portrait by the reality.

This noble edition of the letters<sup>1</sup> which was the chief memorial to Scott of the centenary, — noble in aim and editing, worthy of a man who was a lover as well as a maker of books, — comprises so far the letters from 1787, when Scott was sixteen, down to 1814, the year of the beginning of the Waverley novels. Some idea of the importance of the publication may be gathered from the fact that the first volume, 1787-1807, contains about 200 letters of which 98 are printed for the first time. The second volume contains more than 300, of which nearly three quarters are printed from MS. sources and had previously been unknown or known only in a garbled form. Of the 340 letters in the third volume 240 had never before been printed. Many of Scott's letters were of course given by Lockhart but usually in an incomplete form, and never in Scott's spelling and punctuation. This last is of very minor importance, no doubt, though Scott's spelling is amusingly arbitrary and the punctuation frequently non-existent. He wrote familiar letters at lightning speed and neglected sometimes even considerations of grammar. This imparts a peculiarly personal touch to these yellow old letters and shows that even when least careful and most natural, two of his outstanding qualities — his courtliness and his gift of apt quotation — did not desert him. To Lady Minto he writes in 1808 along with a copy of *Marmion*: "As your Ladyship flattered me by expressing a

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Letters of Sir Walter Scott*, established wherever possible after original manuscripts and including many letters hitherto entirely unpublished or printed in abridged or garbled form, Edited by H. J. C. Grierson, assisted by Davidson Cook, Wm. Parker and others. Centenary Edition. Constable, London. 3 vols. 18/- each.

wish for an early perusal I send my own copy the only one yet finished. I have promised to shew some part of it a freind tomorrow evening but if your Ladyship wishes to have it returned to finish the perusal on the fast day when it will be like 'stolen waters' or 'bread eaten in secret' I will have the honor to return it on Thursday morning if you will be so good as spare it me tomorrow about 6 o'clock. Believe me with great respect Your Ladyship's most Obedient Very humble Servt WALTER SCOTT."<sup>1</sup>

The first volume also contains the "lost letters" to the Ballantynes, "never seen," to quote the wrapper, "since Lockhart used them, and now for the first time and with sensational results, printed from the MSS." The sensationalism of these "lost letters" is not only a matter of the wrapper. They have something of the Gothic novel about them not inappropriate to the writer and his time. They were discovered at the very last moment before going to press in the office of Writers to the Signet, inscribed in the hand of John Ballantyne "*Open not, read not.*" Like the papers found by Catherine Morland in the mysterious chest they proved to be prosaic fact, not romance, but fact of unexpected interest. These are the letters — the whole of the letters and in unmanipulated state — that Scott wrote to the Ballantynes from 1809 to 1818, many of which are given abridged by Lockhart and which are necessary for a judgement of what Lockhart called the "Ballantyne Humbug," viz., the financial relations between Scott and his partners. They throw a new light on his life. They are a revelation of Scott's acute uneasiness and anxiety during the years when he was hard at work — *et pour cause* — on *Waverley* and the first novels. They show that Scott was not, as commonly thought, on Fortune's cap the very button, but that he was dogged during a considerable period of his life by something very like poverty and by the shadow of disaster. The following letter to James Ballantyne concerns a loan of £1000 made to the firm by Ballantyne's brother, who was now demanding it back: "You seem to think that, in making arrangements for clearing off your brother's debt, you give him no preference. I ask you, for what other creditor of the concern you are making similar provision? All those who advanced money to me would be equally glad, I promise you, to be paid, and I can hardly keep some of them quiet. .... I presume your brother's pinch not to be extreme, since he was willing to take the house instead of cash; so I conceive he wants security rather than money. But if he choose to stop the house, of course he may. It is wholly in his power; for I cannot be responsible for paying these bills when they become due. Every farthing of my salary you have long received from the Exchequer as it fell due; and I assure you my family live bare enough..... I wish to God you could send me £25 or £30 just now, as I am almost penniless. You know where my last quarter from Exchequer went."<sup>2</sup> This was in 1814 when money was scarce and the publishing firm of Ballantyne and Co., (which, though few knew it, was simply Scott, for he had supplied all the capital and was alone responsible for all liabilities) had to be wound up as decently as possible, and public bankruptcy was staved off only by the unexpected and amazing success of *Waverley* in that year. The finding of the MS. of the old beginning of *Waverley* among fishing tackle in a forgotten drawer is usually regarded as a romantic accident. It was in reality an urgent and merciful providence.

<sup>1</sup> *Letters*, II, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* I, 530—531. The house referred to was James Ballantyne's.

The regrettable thing is that it did not after all stave off far more serious disaster twelve years later. The publishing business was wound up by 1817, but only after great trouble with slippery John Ballantyne, whose book-keeping was of an unorthodox kind, and it cost Scott much painful correspondence and many a sleepless night when his hands and head should have been free for *Guy Mannering*, *Rob Roy*, and *Old Mortality*. These worries were responsible for the aggravation of the tendency to gall-stones which he had inherited from his mother and which became acute in 1817 — "How the deuce can I make Rob Roy's wife speak with such a curmurrin' in my guts?" — and especially in 1819 when he was writing *Ivanhoe*. It is still more regrettable that the disaster was mainly owing to Scott's recklessness in buying land and antiquities — at the very moment of writing the above letter he was negotiating for the Kaeside land near Abbotsford and making enquiries about the price of Burns' bowl and Rob Roy's gun and sword — and to his extravagant hospitality. He was sanguine that he would be able to carry it all off. "Time and I against any other two", he often quoted, after Philip of Spain. His sanguineness played ducks and drakes with his business. That he entered into business had its admirable side. It was a spirited resistance to the tyranny of publishers. He early saw that publishers had the whip hand of authors, and was determined that Constable and he should chaffer, if chaffer they must, on equal terms. It was to make himself independent of Constable and especially of Constable's brutal partner that in 1809, when the breach happened with the *Edinburgh Review* of which Constable was owner, he set up the publishing firm of Ballantyne & Co. (i.e. himself) and from that point drove hard bargains with Constable and others for his books. To this are due in part the large sums he made from his works.

His sanguineness and his independence are only an aspect of the dream-life he led. Lockhart says he spent half his life in a dreamland and Professor Grierson has a passage in his admirable introduction which throws a new light on Scott's whole career from this point of view. "It was as a sensitive dreamer that Scott saw himself when he looked back on his delicate childhood, happy in the country with his grandparents and a devoted aunt, suffering at home from bullying brothers and servants impatient of his lameness, and the memory of his own experience made him recur more than once to the dangers of a too early indulgence in the charms of feeling and imagination... It is a little difficult to think of Wilfred in *Rokeby* as a self-portrait of Walter Scott rather than of a Shelley or a Lamartine but one will not understand his character or fate if one forgets how much of deliberate self-training had gone to make the strong, active, stoical man of the world and of affairs when the delicacies of early youth were outgrown..... And if Scott outgrew the timidity of delicacy and an acute sensibility, he never outgrew the dreamer. Alike in his conduct of business and in his creative literary work the dreamer and the practical man were blended with one another in a way both fortunate and unfortunate for himself. 'Since I was five years old I cannot remember the time when I had not some ideal part to play for my own amusement..... My life, though not without its fits of waking and strong exertion, has been a sort of dream spent in

Chewing the cud of sweet and bitter fancy.

I have worn a wishing cap, the power of which has often been to divert present



griefs by a touch of the wand of imagination, and gild over the future prospect by prospects more fair than can ever be realised.'..... This side of Scott's character he studied to suppress as contact with his robustious brothers — for Tom alone he seems to have had an affection which no misconduct could destroy — the brutalities of the High School Yards, and finally, the companionship of young Edinburgh advocates, a tough race intellectually, taught him what the world of men was really like, and what it thought of the dreamer. It was quite deliberately that he set himself to be a 'roaring boy,' and later a man of the world, so that when he took up authorship as his business it was, as he tells us, with the resolution 'to keep as far as was in my power abreast of society, continuing to contain my place in general company, without yielding to the very natural temptation of narrowing myself to what is called literary society.'..... Unless one realises this double strain in Scott's nature it will be difficult to understand or be just to — on the one hand the sensitive, imaginative dreamer building castles in the air for his own delight, and on the other the strong and active man who had learned from experience at home and contact with Edinburgh society that the only success which counted for anything in the world was that which gave one power and station, the means to gratify one's tastes, to indulge one's family, and to help and befriend dependants and those who appealed to his acute sense of pity."

The letters do not, I think, reveal any unknown or unsuspected sides of Scott's character. That has been thoroughly and on the whole truly illuminated by Lockhart. But they reveal it more fully, clearly and simply. We are in direct touch with him here, without an intermediate interpretation, we are in his study at Lasswade, or Ashiestiel, or finally Abbotsford, or look over his shoulder (with the Lord Advocate on one occasion) while he writes from his place below the Judges' Bench in the Court of Session. We see the big, robust, kindly nature of the man, with his many friends, high and humble, and his energetic interest in their welfare. Nothing in Scott is so pleasing as the way he is always helping lame dogs over stiles, and the increasing power to do so was one of the things for which he most valued his increasing wealth and position in the world. No sooner does he become Clerk to the Court or Secretary of a Commission or make an influential acquaintance than his first thought seems to be how it can be made to benefit his brother John in the Isle of Man or Leyden in Java or his brother-in-law Carpenter in India. To the last he writes: "The present President of the Board of Controul is my early and intimate friend since we carried our satchels together to the High School of Edinburgh. Think my dear Carpenter if this can be of any use to you. I am sure Robt. Dundas would like to serve my brother. I am also very well acquainted with your present Governor-General Lord Minto, though I believe he was angry with me for not *ratting* (as the phrase is) with others, after Pitt's death. Yet I think I have some influence with him."<sup>1</sup> When he was offered the Laureateship in 1813, he refused it, but urged the claims of Southey, who consequently obtained it. One of his sources of pleasure in the wide range of literary work was that he could employ thereby a number of needy copyists and scribblers. "There was hardly any one of my schemes that did not afford me the means of serving some poor devil of a brother author. There were always huge piles of materials to be arranged, sifted and indexed — volumes of extracts to be transcribed — journeys to be made hither and

<sup>1</sup> *Letters*, II, 14.

thither for ascertaining little facts and dates. — in short, I could commonly keep half a dozen of the ragged regiment of Parnassus in tolerable ease." <sup>1</sup>

He is writing here of the years 1808—1809 and his letters of that period reflect his enormous activity and multifarious literary work. He was writing *Marmion*, editing Dryden, the Somers Tracts, completing Strutts' *Queenhoo Hall*, editing the memoirs of Captain George Carleton, of Sir Robert Carey, preparing for his edition of Swift, starting the *Quarterly* and launching the Ballantynes as publishers. All this in addition to his threefold legal duties as Sheriff of Selkirkshire, Clerk of the Court of Session, and Secretary to the High Commission on Scottish Legal Reform. When the defeatism of the *Edinburgh Review* and Jeffrey's article on *Marmion* at last drove him beyond endurance, it was he who conceived the idea of a counterblast in the shape of an opposition quarterly, and immediately his pen is busy mobilising all his social, literary and political acquaintances in favour of the project. A large number of important letters show how, at first quietly and tactfully but with growing assurance and frankness as the plan found favour, he proposed the plan to Lord Advocate Colquhoun and got him to sound George Canning, the brilliant Tory minister, with regard to Government support. That assured, he obtained Murray as publisher and Gifford as editor (though Murray wanted Scott), and in a letter as long as this article sketched the whole programme for Gifford. Nothing in the correspondence so well as the letters of these last ten weeks of 1808, when he already had a dozen literary engagements, shows his vigour, animating power, and organising talent. He sent out letters to the four quarters of heaven, urging the active co-operation of Ellis, Southey, Fitzpatrick Sharpe, his brother Thomas, Morritt and half a dozen more. How seriously he saw the influence of the Whig periodical is shown from a letter to his friend Ellis: "We foresee a speedy revolution in this country as well as Mr. Cobbett; and to say the truth by degrading the person of the Sovereign, exalting the power of the French armies and their counsels, holding forth that peace (which they allow can only be purchased by the humiliating prostration of our honour) is indispensable to the very existence of our country, I think that for these two years past they have done their utmost to hasten the accomplishment of their own prophecy. Of this work 9000 copies are printed quarterly, and no genteel family *can* pretend to be without it, because, independent of its politics, it gives the only valuable literary criticism which can be met with. Consider, of the number who read this work, how many are there likely to separate the literature from the politics? — how many youths are there upon whose minds the flashy and bold character of the work is likely to make an indelible impression? — and think what the consequence is likely to be. .... Should this plan succeed, you must hang your birding-piece on its hook, take down your old Anti-Jacobin armour, and 'remember your swashing blow.'" <sup>2</sup> — There was much of the fighter in Scott, one may observe. The last sentence is typical of man and style. But there is something of the intriguer too when the case calls for it. He remembered a certain Dr. Greenfield who had been professor of rhetoric at Edinburgh university but had been degraded for scandalous conduct and was then living in retirement in England under the name of Richardson. He was, Scott wrote to Murray, the very man to match Playfair the philosopher of the *Edinburgh*.

<sup>1</sup> Lockhart, chap. XVII. Quoted from Introd. to *Letters*, xxxiv.

<sup>2</sup> *Letters*, II, p. 121.

But the scandalous connection must be concealed, even from Gifford at first. "I inclose you another letter from Mr. *Richardson* — *puisque Richardson il y a* — which will quite prepare you for a meeting with him. His help will be invaluable but discovery the *very devil*. Mind this — they have no hand in the Edinburgh superior to him in philosophy and Belles letters — no not a single one. .... Contrive to be seen as little with Richardson as possible. He is terribly *kenspeckle*." <sup>1</sup>

A chief point of interest in the letters of a literary man to most people is no doubt the insight they give into his works. We know the finished masterpiece, but here we may see how he made it. It is the most excusable kind of curiosity which makes us want to pry into the artist's workshop and observe him in the act of creation. Few revelations of this kind are to be found in Scott's correspondence, for he had many other occupations, to him more interesting. He writes oftener as a laird engaged in field sports, hedging in land, planting trees on the barren hillside and diking off the Tweed; or as a host entertaining notable people. He was never "the partisan of his own poetry," as he said. Perhaps success came too easily to be fully appreciated. He rather wondered at it and considered the public "a damd fool" for being so easily amused.<sup>2</sup> It is well known how little his own family knew of his writings and how his young son Walter came home from school one day with a bloody face after a fight with a boy who had innocently called him "The Lady of the Lake" but was understood by Walter, who had never heard of the poem, to have "ca'ed him a *lassie*." It is chiefly to his lady correspondents — to men he talks "business" — that he writes of his poetry. To Miss Seward he writes a jocular account of his method of writing *The Lay of the Last Minstrel*. "I began and wandered forward, like one in a pleasant country, getting to the top of one hill to see a prospect, and to the bottom of another to enjoy a shade; and what wonder if my course has been devious and desultory, and many of my excursions altogether unprofitable to the advance of my journey?..... In the process of the romance the page intended to be a principal person in the work, contrived (from the baseness of his natural propensities I suppose) to slink down stairs into the kitchen, and now he must e'en abide there..... The sixth canto is altogether redundant; for the poem should certainly have closed with the union of the lovers, when the interest, if any, was at an end. But what could I do? I had my book" — the magic book — "and my page still on my hands, and must get rid of them at all events." <sup>3</sup>..... No reviewer saw his defects better than himself.

Lady Louisa Stuart was his best critic and in his letters to her we occasionally get a glimpse of the workshop. In January 1808 he writes to her: "Marmion is, at this instant, gasping upon Flodden field, and there I have been obliged to leave him for these few days in the death pangs. I hope I shall find time enough this morning to knock him on the head with two or three thumping stanzas." <sup>4</sup>..... Later Lady Louisa apparently objected that Clare's revelation of Constance's death to Marmion in his last agony was needless and cruel. Scott replies: "Clara has no wish to embitter Marmions last moments and is only induced to mention the death of Constance because she observes that the wounded mans anxiety for her deliverance prevents his

<sup>1</sup> Sc. conspicuous. *Letters* II, 184—185.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* II, 156.

<sup>3</sup> *ib.* I, 242—243.

<sup>4</sup> *ib.* II, 3.



attending to his own spiritual affairs. It seems natural however that knowing by the Abbess or however you please the share which Marmion had in the fate of Constance she should pronounce the line assigned to her in such a manner as perfectly conveyed to his conscience the whole truth although her gentleness avoided conveying it in direct terms. We are to consider too that Marmion had from various workings of his own mind been led to suspect the fate of Constance — so that the train being ready laid the slightest hint of her fate communicated the whole tale of terror to his conviction — Were I to read the passage I would hesitate a little like one endeavouring to seek a soft mode of conveying painful intelligence

In vain for Constance is your zeal  
She — died at Holy Isle

Perhaps after all this is too fine spun and requires more from my gentle readers to fill up my sketch than I am entitled to exact." <sup>1</sup>..... This alteration was approved by Lady Louisa and introduced into the text; but it did not occur to Scott that the incidents and motives he *hints* at here, namely, the disclosure to Clara by the Abbess or "however you please" of Marmion's baseness to Constance, and Clare's secret thought, if introduced into the poem, would have made the character of Clare more interesting and strengthened the detail of the plot.

His letters to Robert Surtees at this time show that the subject of *Waverley* began to interest him immediately after *Marmion* was off his hands. Surtees had suggested a poem about the Forty-five and in April, 1808, Scott replies: "As for Prince Charles, 'He, that wandering knight so fair,' we will talk about him when we meet. I have thought of a Highland poem before hanging my harp on the willows; and perhaps it would be no bad setting for such a tale to suppose it related for her amusement, in the course of his wanderings after the fatal battle of Culloden. Flora Macdonald, King-burgh, Lochiel, the Kennedies, and many other characters of dramatic [interest] might be introduced; and the time is now passed away when the theme would have both danger and offence in it." <sup>2</sup> Is "her" a mistake for "his", i.e., Prince Charles', which would make the only good sense? In that case he first conceived *The Lady of the Lake* as a frame-poem to be told to Prince Charles during his hiding in Skye. Lockhart has not this letter and neither he nor Scott in his introduction to the poem says anything of such a plan. Yet it seems an interesting probability. <sup>3</sup> When Surtees received this and read the lines at the end bidding farewell to the "Harp of the North", he again urged Scott, in the affected style which the English antiquarian used, to write "*la très piteuse et délectable histoire du preux et errant Chevalier Charles Stuart.*" The plan was put in fulfilment three years later, but unfortunately Flora Macdonald and Lochiel were forgotten and for the prince's heroic wanderings after Culloden, he substituted Waverley's tremors in a stage-coach.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Letters*, II, 28.

<sup>2</sup> *ib.* II, 37.

<sup>3</sup> In October, 1809, we find Scott helping Joanna Baillie with her Highland play, *The Family Legend*, which he sometimes refers to as "The Lady of the Rock". This may have suggested the title of *The Lady of the Lake*, which he began about this time. Miss Baillie's heroine was called Ellen too — "Ellen on the Rock", Scott calls her once.

Of *Rokeby* we hear more than of the other poems because it was inspired by his admiration of the scenery of his friend Morritt's estate, and as Morritt supplied him with notes on the countryside and its traditions and was naturally deeply interested in the poem, there are frequent references to the poem in the letters that passed backward and forward. In December 1811 it is "sketched... I have all your scenery deeply imprinted in my memory." In March next year Scott writes that he had destroyed the first canto because it might have hurt people's political feelings. But it "does and must go forward or my trees and inclosures might perchance stand still." (He was busy with Abbotsford.) "As for the house and the poem," he writes in May, "there are twelve masons hammering at the one and one poor noodle at the other so they are both in progress." In the autumn he stays some time with Morritt to revive memories of the locality and on his return sends him the first three cantos and "fears he has made one blunder," namely, in describing the brooks. "I hope I am mistaken. You will see the passage, and if they are the same rivulet, the leaf must be cancelled."<sup>1</sup>

Scott's care for geographical accuracy seems at first sight strange in a writer so rapid and in some respects careless, but the interest in locality was of the essence of his art. *The Minstrelsy* was the fruit, he himself said, of "local attachment," the recollections and "thousand little nameless associations" connected with a scene; and the idea recurs more than once in his letters. Lockhart quotes Skene on the influence of local associations on Scott, and perhaps this explains his frequent choice for his romances of scenes which possessed an everyday familiarity for him. His romanticism is often the romanticism of the familiar. In a famous passage of the *Biographia Literaria* Coleridge tells how Wordsworth and he agreed to a division of labour in writing the *Lyrical Ballads*. Coleridge was to make the strange seem familiar and Wordsworth was to make the familiar seem strange. With regard to places Scott combined the two methods. The romanticist commonly seeks romance in Italy, the East, the Wild West — everywhere but where he is. Scott brought romance to his own doorstep. William of Deloraine's ride was over the hill and moor at the back of Ashiestiel, every foot of which he knew. All the early and best part of *The Heart of Midlothian* takes place in scenes which Scott, when he lived at Lasswade, passed every day he rode in to court. Muschat's Cairn, the place of Jeanie's meeting with Effie's lover, was just off the road. Davie Deans' cottage was on the very roadside, and along that road Jeanie started barefoot to London. The scene of Marmion's midnight passage of arms in the third canto is Gifford, a village ten miles from Lasswade. Scott had often driven in the Hawes Fly in which Lovel first met the Antiquary. The Edinburgh incidents of *The Abbot* take place in the very wynds and closes in the High Street and Canongate through which Scott constantly passed when in town. He found inspiration in familiar places and in his turn invested them for others with romance. He as it were repaid a debt.

One catches in the letters few glimpses of his more intimate life. One would have liked descriptions of his home, his farming, his travels, Lasswade, Ashiestiel, and Abbotsford. Allusions enough there are, for example to Mrs. Scott's narrowly escaping being shot by a careless sportsman or to their perils returning home through the floods; to his "labouring Walter daily in Caesar, Virgil and on Sundays in Buchanan's psalms ..... Between yawning and

<sup>1</sup> *Letters*, III, *passim*.

scratching our head we get on pretty well." But Scott was too busy a man to fill his letters with himself. He is the least egotistic of writers. For the egotism which is the charm of some letter-writers one must go to Cowper and that not only because Cowper had the discursive gift but because he had ample leisure. Even when Scott writes to unliterary friends like Lady Abercorn, the charming Irishwoman who very obviously had a strong liking for him, he has little to say of domestic or strictly personal matters. Even to her his talk is on business of a kind — books sent, messages, requests, a present of flower-roots from his garden. Had Lockhart not done it for us so well, we should be quite unable from these letters to form a picture of Scott's private life; and for this reason as well as others they should be read along with Lockhart. The letters, as Professor Grierson says, are written to entertain Scott's correspondents, not to unbosom himself, and are filled with news, anecdotes and the like, in other words facts. Now and then a deeper note breaks through, as when he writes of young Lord Scott's death, or when he refers to the gravity of the situation on the continent and later to the triumphs of Wellington. Even to his children — to his favourite Sophia — his letters, or rather notes, are curiously perfunctory. Yet there never was a better father. It is not due to want of feeling or depth of conviction; it is simply that he was not the man to wear his heart on his sleeve. In this he belonged to the eighteenth century and avoided the emotional or spiritual. "*Trop de zèle, monsieur*," might have been Scott's remark, said however with geniality.

It is one of the pleasant traits of the letters that they deal much with outdoor life — "long sheep and short sheep, and tups and gimmers, and hogs and dinmonts."<sup>1</sup> There is nothing stuffy about them. Mutton and dung interest Scott as much as books, and his agricultural ambition certainly took precedence of his literary interests. James Ballantyne said that a compliment on his farming made his face light up when praise of his writings left him cold. The proportion of interest is perhaps shown in the following paragraph to Ellis: "I have a great deal to write you about a new poem which I have on the anvil — also, upon the melancholy death of a favourite greyhound bitch — rest her body, since I dare not say soul! She was of high blood and excellent promise. Should any of your sporting friends have a whelp to spare, of a good kind, and of the female sex, I would be grateful beyond measure, especially if she has had the distemper. As I have quite laid aside the gun, coursing is my only and constant amusement, and my valued pair of four-legged champions, Douglas and Percy, wax old and *unfeary*."<sup>2</sup> He had the afforestation, or rather the restoration, of Ettrick "forest" very much at heart and his improvement of Ashiestiel and Abbotsford, which are on its fringe, was meant by him to be an example of what could and should be done by all his neighbours to renew the ancient beauty of the countryside. "Ettrick Forest boasts finely shaped hills and clear romantic streams; but alas! they are bare to wilderness, and denuded of the beautiful natural wood with which they were formerly shaded. It is mortifying to see that, though wherever the sheep are excluded, the copse has immediately sprung up in abundance, so that enclosures only are wanting to restore the wood wherever it might be useful or ornamental, yet hardly a proprietor has attempted to give it fair play for a resurrection."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Letters*, I, 222.

<sup>2</sup> *ib.* II, 269.

<sup>3</sup> *ib.* I, 222.



Harden, the seat of his family, was in Ettrick forest, and it was with the feelings of an Ettrick man that he wrote one of his most stirring songs:

"March, march, Ettrick and Teviotdale,  
Why the deil dinna ye march forward in order?"

His position as laird widened his interests and helped him on occasion even in his literary work. It was as a Tweeddale laird that he had a sympathetic insight into the work of that other Tweeddale laird, Thomas the Rhymer.<sup>1</sup> He had the politics of a laird. What a true-blue Tory, Fascist and Die-hard he was! His sherifffdom had a considerable population of weavers and mill-hands, and when in 1812 disturbances broke out in the Midland manufacturing towns of England, the influence was speedily felt in the border towns of Scotland. To his brother-in-law Carpenter he deplores "the mistaken lenity of government. ... The infection had even reached the little thriving community of Galashiels a flourishing village in my district. I was not long however of breaking these associations and securing their papers; the principal rogue escaped me, for, having heard I was suddenly come into the place, he observed 'tis no' for naught that the hawk whistles' and so took to the hills and escaped."<sup>2</sup> No wonder the Jedburgh men wanted to "burk Sir Walter" twenty years later.

The style of these letters, as was to be expected in a man so devoid of affectation, expresses Scott's personality to an unusual degree. Hence it is definable only in terms of his personality. For if we describe its diction as — sometimes — more Latinised than we are fond of today, as curiously lacking in sensuousness, the suggestive characteristic, and the sentence patterns as — sometimes — those of the eighteenth century,<sup>3</sup> we are no nearer to a definition of its peculiarity. That is the reflex of Scott's personality. It is artless and spontaneous with the art of the born and practised story-teller. He has not the air of waiting and searching for the perfect word like Stevenson. He is indeed too free of that preciosity; if he has not Stevenson's lightness either, he has weight and robustness. He has not Cowper's sweetness and grace, but he has the life and sunshine which poor Cowper lacked. He is plain, but vital and genial. He is plain in the sense that, though there is ornament, there is or seems to be no deliberate ornament. His metaphors and illustrations are a part of the man and, like himself outside his study, they are seldom literary. Terry the actor was surprised, Scott told Miss Baillie, to hear Mackenzie and him once talking together "like sportsmen and horse jockies at some public place. I suppose he thought we should have spoke in iambics." The racy quotations with which his letters, especially those to literary correspondents, are interlarded, come mostly from Shakespeare, ballad lore and history, and the last two at least were second nature to him.

He expressed his dissatisfaction with the first number of the *Quarterly* by quoting the Duke of Argyle after his defeat at Sheriffmoor —

"If it be na weel bobbitt  
We'll bob it again."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Letters*, I, 215.

<sup>2</sup> *ib.* III, 152.

<sup>3</sup> The numerous extracts I have given will be evidence enough that the style of the letters is, as one would expect, less Latinised and more modern than that of the novels at least.

<sup>4</sup> *Letters*, II, 174.

There was nothing bookish about that. It was a part of the still living past of Scotland. It was also the apt and spontaneous expression of Scott's defiant optimism. Scott's style possesses at its best a gay and gallant intrepidity, the ebullition of the high spirits that made him a delightful companion.

Groningen.

J. A. FALCONER.

## Notes and News.

**A-Examen 1932.** De *Ned. Staatscourant* van 12 Januarije 1933, no. 9 (Bijvoegsel), bevat het verslag der commissie in 1932 belast geweest met het afnemen van de examens in de Engelse taal (l.o. en m.o. A). Wij nemen er de volgende opmerkingen uit over betreffende het examen middelbaar onderwijs :

„De commissie geeft haar opvolgster in overweging het tweede gedeelte van het schriftelijk werk te doen bestaan in een vertaling uit het Engelsch. Zij wenscht aan het verslag nog eenige opmerkingen toe te voegen in verband met enkele onderdeelen van het examen.

Het trof de commissie, dat in de vertaling van het Nederlandsch in het Engelsch vele fouten gemaakt werden tegen die regels van de elementaire spraakkunst, waarbij het verschil tusschen de twee naar voren komt. Het ontbrak verscheidenen kandidaten aan voldoende inzicht in de grammaticale kennis, die zij hun leerlingen zullen moeten bijbrengen, hetgeen o.a. tot uiting kwam in een onjuist gebruik van de progressieve vorm, van praeteritum en perfectum, van de vorm op ing. Moeilijkheden van dezen aard treft men steeds aan, ook in een vertaling, die niet opzettelijk gekozen moeilijkheden bevat.

De onvoldoende studie van de spraakkunst bleek ook bij de vertaling van den Engelschen tekst; zoo waren bij de vertaling van *arranged for him to be moved*, van de dertig stukken door één examiner beoordeeld, zeventien onjuist. Als de commissie de aandacht van toekomstige kandidaten op de elementaire grammatica vestigt, dan wil zij in dit woord „elementair” geenszins de betekenis leggen van eenvoudig of gemakkelijk. Zij acht integendeel een grondige bestudeering van teksten onder leiding van een bekwaam docent onontbeerlijk om een juist inzicht te verwerven.

Ook trof het de aandacht van de commissie, dat tal van kandidaten spel-fouten maakten als *fourty*, *photo's*, *freeer*, het koppelteken in telwoorden, e.d. weglieten; dergelijke slordigheden mogen bij een aanstaand leeraar niet voorkomen.

Bij de vertaling van het Engelsch in het Nederlandsch bleek, dat sommige kandidaten hadden gestreefd naar wat in zekere kringen „zuiver” Nederlandsch wordt genoemd; het gevolg was in veel gevallen een verkeerde vertaling. De commissie acht het onjuist woorden als *chirurg*, *aquarel*, *chalet* te mijden, een militair hospitaal aan te duiden met *soldaten-ziekenhuis* of van *massage* een verklarenden uitleg te geven bij wijze van vertaling. Woorden als *operatie*, *demonstratie* kunnen in het Nederlandsch de eenig juiste vertaling zijn van de vormverwante Engelse woorden. De commissie waarschuwt er evenwel tegen niet in een ander uiterste te vervallen en bijv. *rivals* te vertalen door *rivalen*.

Daar de raad van haar voorgangster nog steeds niet voldoende ter harte genomen bleek, geeft ook deze commissie als haar meening te kennen, dat zij het, in verband met de studie van het taaleigen van groot belang acht, dat de kandidaten zich bij hun lezen niet beperken tot belletristische lectuur. De commissie acht het eveneens gewenscht, dat de kandidaten, zonder vakkennis na te streven, toch iets weten omtrent land en volk, dat zij bijv. niet geheel vreemd staan tegenover de Staatskerk, het Parlement, de rechtspraak, en in staat zijn den hoofdinhoud van een Engelsche krant met begrip te lezen. De lectuur van populaire werkjes, zooals o.a. voorkomen in *Benn's Sixpenny Library*, kan voor het verwerven van deze kennis van groot nut zijn."

---

**Holiday Courses.** We draw attention to various holiday courses for foreign students to be held in London and Cambridge, particulars of which are sent with this number.

---

## Reviews.

*Altenglisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch.* Von F. HOLTHAUSEN. (Germanische Bibliothek IV, 7). Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1932, 1-3 Lieferungen (a-öhta), 240 p. (Price RM. 3.— each part.)

An etymological dictionary of Old English has long been a desideratum in the field of Teutonic linguistics; but the fact that as far back as the late nineties such a work was announced by Professor Holthausen may have played a part in preventing others from launching into a similar enterprise. In the meantime Prof. Holthausen published from time to time articles which showed that he was constantly busy with Old English etymologies; but it is only in the autumn of his life that he begets what he planned at the beginning of a well-filled academic career.

Having waited so long it may be said that the expectancy of Anglists was great. They will perhaps be somewhat disappointed by the small compass of this dictionary: judging from the three parts already published<sup>1</sup> the text will not cover when complete more than 370 octavo pages. Of course it is not quite fair to censure a work before the preface has been issued, and it may be that Professor Holthausen will tell us if and why he has been compelled to such limits. But, taking into account his other books, from the *Beowulf* edition down to his *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der englischen Sprache* one may wonder if Professor Holthausen is not spontaneously inclined to a very compact treatment of philological data.

Now, without in the least playing the sedulous ape to Macaulay, we may ask ourselves, before opening this *Wörterbuch*, what we should expect to be the scope and purpose of an Old English etymological dictionary published at the present time.

We have, on one hand, a fairly good presentation of English etymology at

---

<sup>1</sup> Part 4 appeared after this review had been sent to press. — Ed.



large in the *New English Dictionary* though, of course, the early volumes are becoming somewhat antiquated, but the historical treatment is invaluable; on the other, there is no satisfactory dictionary either of Indo-European (Walde-Pokorny's being a collection of unsifted material rather than a real dictionary) or of Teutonic, since Falk-Torp's revision of Fick's *Wortschatz der germanischen Spracheinheit* is not up-to-date (being, moreover, exhausted). When looking up Old English etymologies we are obliged to make use of quite an array of other dictionaries, encyclopædias, articles and dissertations of very unequal value; which implies a considerable loss of time: to say nothing of the fact that if a word happens to be specifically Old English or even West Germanic it is ten to one that our search will be vain: the need for an Old English etymological dictionary cannot, therefore, be over-emphasized.

But what exactly should it give us? Etymology has made immense progress not only since Pott and Schleicher but since Skeat and Diez. Until the end of the 19th century an etymological dictionary was a collection of comparisons compiled according to phonetic laws, showing the forms taken by a word in cognate languages and winding up if possible with a reference to some "root" in the parent tongue. But to-day, with the important advance made by archæology and semantics, we are in a position to be more exacting. Language comparison is no longer reduced to more or less accurate phonetic equations, and the etymology of a word should be the history of that word between two given dates, accounting for all changes in form, gender, meaning, use, influence that have occurred and can be explained.

An etymological dictionary compiled in 1933 ought to tell us everything certain that is known about a given vocabulary, thus dispensing its readers from having to refer to other numerous books, and at the same time to let us know what in that vocabulary is still unexplained. Such dictionaries are not mere entities: in the last decade we have had among others Hellquist's for Swedish, Weekley's for modern English, Kluge-Götze-Krause's for modern German, Bloch's for modern French, and, last but not least, Ernout-Meillet's for Latin.

Now if we open Professor Holthausen's dictionary what do we find in it?

It contains a fairly complete collection of OE. simple words, together with a selected list of compounds and derivatives, though I have not been able to detect the reason why certain compounds are admitted while others, equally interesting (especially when they are represented in ME. or ModE.), are left out. Thus for *dæg*, *ān-dæge*, *dægehwele*, *dægenlic*, *dæghwām*, *dæggrēd*, *dægðern* are included but not *dæges-ēage* (daisy), *dægri* "dawn" (dayrim), *dægsteorra* (daystar), *dægweorc* (daywork); cross-references are sometimes, but not always given. The order is strictly alphabetical save for derivatives which are given under the simple form, a practice which has become usual and is to be recommended. Words beginning with *æ* are listed separately, which does not give rise to any difficulty; but Prof. Holthausen lists also separately initial *g* = Teut. *g* and initial *g* = Teut. *j*. This principle takes it for granted that the reader who looks up a word already knows its etymology, which is manifestly absurd. The quantity is marked of course (the author writes *bitan*, but *bio*), and so is palatalization (*cyċġel*, *ġeagl*) and *ē* represents the mutation of *a*. As no explanations are given the student might perhaps wonder how ModE. (?) *gain* can be the development of OE. *ġegn* "gerade, direkt", but I suspect there is some error in the wording of the article.

Prof. Holthausen has included a certain number of proper names and

place-names, which will meet with general approval, I suppose; indeed I am afraid that some scholars may wish he had given a greater number of them.

The meaning of the OE. word is always given, sometimes to an extent which amounts to lavishness; thus *duguð* is translated "Tüchtigkeit, Wert, Stärke; Pracht, Ruhm, Ehre; Hilfe, Gabe, Nutzen; Reichtum, Glück, Anstand; Gefolge, Kriegerschaft; Adel, Volk", and though I confess this is an extreme case it is by no means infrequent (*dōm* is defined by eighteen words) and five or six equivalents are of common occurrence. In view of the terrible concision from which the dictionary suffers in other matters one is led to think that if place was to be spared at all cost, why not cut the definitions? On the other hand the differences of meaning in the other languages quoted are not always given.

But the most puzzling, not to say irritating, problem raised by this *Etymologisches Wörterbuch* is that of the etymologies themselves. We feel the greatest respect for Prof. Holthausen; the width and accuracy of his learning need not be questioned; moreover he has been collecting material for this dictionary for long years; we have not the slightest doubt that he knows everything that would have been required to make of his *Etymologisches Wörterbuch* an invaluable companion to OE. studies. We expected a splendid book; we are given a skeleton instead.

First of all we are at a loss to discover the rules followed by the author: he might have limited his treatment of OE. etymology to the Teutonic field, giving in full the corresponding forms in old as well as in modern Teutonic languages, tracing the development of a word no further back than common Teutonic but commenting on the social, religious, archæological background. Or again he might, following a pretty general practice, have gone back to Indo-European, but on the same broad lines. Thus the reader would have been able to see what is inherited from the parent stock, what is purely Teutonic, what is West Germanic and what are English innovations; and, at the same time, whether an OE. word has survived until the ME. or the ModE. period or if it has died out and been replaced by some other word.

Now sometimes the history of a word prior to OE. receives full treatment, but sometimes not. When a word is represented in other Indo-European languages, Prof. Holthausen generally gives a few equivalents and refers the reader to Walde-Pokorny's *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*: a practice which might be advantageous if that work was not at the same time very unwieldy and very expensive. He who buys Holthausen's Dictionary will have to buy Walde-Pokorny's too. If we leave aside Walde-Pokorny, references are few and far between: sometimes to periodicals (*Beiblatt zur Anglia*, *Paul und Braunes Beiträge*, *Herrigs Archiv* as a rule) sometimes to a few recent treatises (especially Ritter, Szogs and Wissmann); but these are bare references to book and page. When some illuminating criticism has been made, why not sum it up? Now it appears that Prof. Holthausen has deliberately refrained from giving any sort of commentary.

We have already alluded to the extraordinary concision of the volume. There are to be found in it articles such as: "*āræd*? (s. Beibl. 40, 30)", and nothing else, and even:

"gnorn 2. "traurig", s. *gnyrn*."

"gnyrn f. "Trauer, Unglück, Beleidigung, Fehler", s. *gnorn*".

Of course, such puzzles are of rare occurrence, but everywhere and in every way the book is marred by its brevity. Under *ātih* "Unkraut" we are referred

to Ritter, Beitr. S. 60. The reader who does not happen to have Ritter's book on the shelves of his library cannot know that this is a gloss in the Lindisfarne Matthew Gospel: for the word is not recorded in any of the existing dictionaries; would it have been superfluous to tell him?

Again Prof. Holthausen deals separately with *āwel* "Haken, Gabel" and *æġ*, *āl* "Ahle" and this is quite plausible, but he ought to point it out and give his reasons. Many of the comparisons or of the etymologies proposed would have to be qualified.

And the result of such laconism is not seldom obscurity. Under *āðexe* "Eidechse" we are told "nur im 2. Gliede = as, *ēgithassa*..... zu gr. *ὄφις*, *ἔχις*"; as a matter of fact it is *ā-*, *egi-* which may be compared to *ἔχις*; while nothing is said of the second element \**þahsiō* OHG. \**dehsa*, MHG. *dehse* "spindle".

To connect *clāfre* "Klee" with Serbian *glib* "Kot", OSlav. *u-gliblja* "bleibe stecken" without saying, as does for instance Kluge-Götze, "wegen des klebrigen Safts" is to leave the reader in the dark.

One would suppose, as we said, that an Old English etymological dictionary would let the student know something of the ulterior history of the words. It seems to be a rule with Prof. Holthausen to give the ModE. representative of such OE. words as have survived until the present time either in standard English or in dialects, but he leaves out the words that have died out during the ME. period; this is all the more to be regretted as all such words are recorded in the NED. Thus for the letter *D* which occupies 14 pages of Prof. Holthausen's dictionary I have counted no less than twenty-two ME. forms which might have been included (not to speak of ModE. *do* and *doom* whose omission is probably due to oversight.) For if the *origin* of OE. words is interesting it seems that their *survival* or their *disappearance* is equally important. For instance the fact that *ædre* "Ader" is still represented by ME. *eddre*, but has been ousted after the 14th century by *vein* is significant: it would have been worth mentioning.

But even the ModE. forms are sometimes omitted; why, one wonders, does Prof. Holthausen point out under *bold* "Haus" that the word is found in German place-names under the form *-büttel* and omit the fact that it also survives in English place-names in *-bottle*, *Bootle* and *-bo(u)ld* (cf. Ekwall. *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, 28, 82-91). Indeed the rich material at hand in place-names has often been overlooked: under *čiosol* "Kies(el)" one misses a reference to ModE. *chesil*, *chisel* and to such place-names as the *Chesil Bank* and *Chesilton* in Dorset.

Prof. Holthausen is to be approved when he avails himself of his vast knowledge of Frisian and Westphalian to strengthen the etymology of a word. But on the other hand modern Scandinavian instances are sparsely represented. Would it not have been worth while, for instance, to state ever so briefly that the semantic development of OE. *cwene* "Weib, Dienerin, Dirne" has a parallel in Swedish *kona*, which is the same word?

Words borrowed from Latin or Old French do not always receive adequate treatment at Prof. Holthausen's hands. *Antefn* is not derived from Lat. *antiphona* but from a Low Latin *antefana* (Gregory of Tours) or, still more probably, from a Romance form with the stress on the second syllable; *ante-* having taken the place of *anti-* by popular etymology. *Arblast* does not come from OFrench *arbaleste* but from *arblastre* which in its turn is not derived from Lat. *arcubalista* (sic! for *arcuballista*) but from the secondary



form *arcuballistra*. *Mangere* "Händler" is said to be from Lat. *mangō* while *mangian* "handeln" would seem to be derived from *mangere*. I am sure that Prof. Holthausen did not mean to say that. Excess of brevity is to be held responsible for such confused statements. Of course *mangian* (under which OSax. *mangōn* and ONorse *manga* might have been mentioned) is WGerm. \**mangō-jan* coined from Lat. *mangō* and it is *mangian* that has given birth to *mangere* (under which OHG., ONorse *mangari* are wanting).

On the other hand Prof. Holthausen gives the wrong impression that ModE. *abbot* might be directly evolved from OE. *abbod*. The interesting fact is, of course, that *abbot* was refashioned in the 12th century under the influence of the learned Latin form *abbātem*.

A very sad instance of the dryness of Prof. Holthausen's mode of presentation is the article *cāsere* which runs simply thus: "*cāsere* m. "Kaiser" < lat. *Caesar*"! First of all it is of course inaccurate to say that the OE. word has been borrowed directly from the Latin (and yet the same impression recurs constantly when one reads this dictionary). And then it would have been necessary for such important Latin words borrowed by Teutonic which have a well-known history to give some explanations. *Carcern*, *cāul*, *čealc*, *čietel* are no better treated: they are disposed of with a bare reference to the Latin prototype; but under *čēap* we get the other Germanic forms. Why such difference of treatment?

Indeed history, linguistic history, which should come to the front in such a book, is totally wanting.

This is all the more astonishing as we are certain that Prof. Holthausen has his own well-grounded opinion on moot points. Take for instance *cēre* in *bio-cēre* "Imker". It has been supposed by Feist that we have to do with a "travelling word" coming from the East, Assy. *kāsu*. Prof. Holthausen does not share this point of view and thinks that the word belongs to the group of *γαστήρ* but in his dictionary he does not give any etymology, not even a reference to G.R.M. 17, 469 where he has proposed his own views.

The Indo-European background of the OE. vocabulary is never stressed as it ought to be. The reader should have been told that *bēre* "Gerste", *æppel* "Apfel" or *béan* "Bohne" belong to the North-Western group of Indo-European languages. Under the last-mentioned word a reference to Hoops, *Waldbäume* would have been to the point and though the relation with Lat. *faba*, OPruss. *babo*, Slav. \**bobŭ* is not quite clear, something should have been said about it and the suggestion of Marstrander N.T.S. 3, 302, that Com. Teut. \**baðunō* has undergone a dissimilation (cf. *haubiþ*, *hofuð*) is too illuminating to be left out. What we read under *more* "Möhre" does not underline the essential fact that this is evidently a word common to Teutonic and Slavonic, just as under *eoh* "Pferd" it should have been said that, except for Slavonic, this is the Indo-European name of the horse. On the other hand, as there was no common name for the lamb, as has been pointed out by Meillet B.S.L. 24, 182, a comparison of *éanian* "lammen" with *ἀμνός* and Lat. *agnus* (<\**agwno-s*) is very improbable.

Words such as *gæst* "Geist", *hælend* "Heiland" are essentially West Germanic: Prof. Holthausen does not say it and omits to tell the reader that in OE. *hælend* is regularly used instead of "Jesus" and that the last record of the word is in the *Ancren Riwele*; *éastre* "Ostern" (under which we miss *Eostræ* found in Bede and a reference to *Earendel*) does not specify the interesting fact that the use of this word is strictly limited to England whence

the Anglo-Saxon missionaries brought it into Germany, the other Teutonic dialects using *pāscha* only. For *diepan* "taufen" it should have been said that the current word meaning "to baptize" is *fulwian* (which, unfortunately, has been omitted) and that the religious use of *diepan* originated with the Goths whence it passed to West Germanic, and thence to Scandinavian tribes. Under *god* "Gott" it is not said that Oldcel. *goð*, *guð* was primitively neuter, a fact of capital importance for the history of the word which has been so well elucidated by M. Cahen: his dissertation *Le mot "dieu" en scandinave*, might have been referred to. It is well-known to-day that religious taboo has had an important influence on the vocabulary: it explains the form of *éage* "Auge" or the name *bera* "Bär" (cf. now R. von Kienle in *Wörter und Sachen* 14, 61-65): but this does not appear in this dictionary.

The same remarks might be made on the social or archæological background. If space was limited, Prof. Holthausen might have contented himself with referring to such works as Hoops, *Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde* and Schrader-Nehring. But even then we do believe that there are things which should have been explained. If the reader is not told that in Teutonic antiquity bridges were made of branches and boards and used to cross marshes how can he understand the different meanings of the words cognate with *bryčg*? The history of the word *béacen* "Zeichen" has been made clear by Wadstein (*Norden och Västeuropa i gammal tid*), that of *cyčel* "Kuchen" by N. O. Heinertz (*Studier tillägnade Axel Kock*, 145-158), that of *hæðen* "heidnisch" by Braune, Wessén and Hoops, while Weisweiler has written an admirable book on "Busse". But we are bound to say that Prof. Holthausen has simply ignored them in his dictionary. And this is a great pity, because Prof. Holthausen has given us a book which is neither convenient nor up-to-date. It looks like the sort of work which one might expect to have been produced some fifty years ago in the "Jung-Grammatiker" era at a time when linguistics was very different from what it has become now. And yet this *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* will be indispensable because it is the sole work of its kind and perhaps will not be superseded before long; but we regret to say that at the same time it is very unsatisfactory.

Paris.

Ecole Pratique des Hautes Études.

F. MOSSÉ.

---

*Studien zu den Aktionsarten im Frühmittelenglischen.* Von DR. HANS WALTER HÄUSERMANN. Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, LIV Band. Wien und Leipzig, Wilhelm Braumüller, 1930. pp. viii + 86. RM. 5.

The materials worked up in this treatise have been taken from three thirteenth century texts, namely *Lazamon A* (B is only quoted in the case of noteworthy deviations from A, or if a form or passage is only found in the later version), *King Horn* (all three versions have been used), and *Havelok*. These three texts have evidently been chosen because they may be taken to represent an early South Western, an early South Eastern, and a rather later North Eastern dialect variety.

E.S. XV. 1933.

In the Introduction the Author gives a short account of the various ways the difficult problems of 'Aktionsart' and 'aspect' have been approached by different scholars, and states his reasons for having adopted, with some modifications, Streitberg's system and terminology.

The numerous verbs dealt with are treated alphabetically in two chapters under the headings 'Perfektiva' and 'Imperfektiva' respectively. These headings must, of course, not be taken too literally. The verbs discussed in the first chapter are, it is true, most of them always perfective, at any rate in the texts examined, but there are also a good many that, though mostly perfective, are sometimes imperfective as well. The same remark applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to the second chapter.

A short final chapter gives a summary of the results arrived at, the most important of which are:

A number of perfective verbs occur with and without the prefix *a-*, as [*a*]büggen, [*a*]cweðen, [*a*]dræden, and a dozen others. The forms with the prefix are more distinctly perfective than the prefixless ones. The same holds good of *for-* and *to-* in the case of *bersten*, *breken*, *wurðen*.

If certain prefixes are added to imperfective verbs, the result is not only that the graphic force of these verbs is enhanced, but also that they become perfective. It is especially the prefix *a-* that occurs in this function. *For-* and *to-* make certain verbs, like *brennen*, *don*, *drazen*, *drizen*, *fare*n, *feren*, *heawen*, and *læden* effective. The prefix *to-* is frequently intensified by placing *al* before it; *al* and *to* may have been felt to be one word.

Some prefixes do not necessarily make a verb perfective; such prefixes are, *bi-* (frequently), *æt-* (in *æt-healden*, *æt-standen*), *for-* (in *for-beoden*), *of-* (in *of-dræden*, *of-þenchen*), *wið-* (in *wið-drazen*, *wið-healden*).

Verbs expressing movement are mostly made perfective by means of adverbs.

Verbs of giving and taking are 'punctual'; *a-* and *for-* do not make *given* perfective, nor do *a-* and *under-* change the aspect of *fon*.

An imperfective infinitive may be made perfective by a finite form of *cumen*, *ginnen*, *setten*, *læten*, *linnen*, *blinnen*.

Although Dr. Häusermann has made use of a considerable amount of material, the circumstance that the whole of it has been taken from only three texts, two of which are, moreover, rather short ones, would make it a risky proceeding to generalize every one of his statements. The verb *standen* (p. 70 f.), to take one instance, is always imperfective in these texts. Sometimes, however, this verb is ingressive, namely when it means 'to stop', 'to come to a standstill', as: *South Eng. Leg.*, 387.357, *huy comen and founden seint Thomas: riht as þis womman seide. Þe Qiene stod and him bi-heold; Rob. of Brunne, Handl. S.*, 5611, *He sagh Pers come þerwith-alle; ..... Pers stode, and lokyd on hym Felunlyche with yzen grym.*

Questions of aspect are sometimes of a highly ticklish nature, and a given passage may strike different readers differently. Thus, on p. 22 it is stated that in the following two quotations, and several others, from *Havelok biginnen* is used pleonastically: *Hise fet he kisten and hundred sybes / þe tos, þe nayles and the lithes / So þat he bigan to wakne / And with hem ful sore to blake* (2164); — *He cam driuende up-on a stede / And bigan til him to grede* (2703). As to the first of these two passages the Author remarks that 'vielleicht auch ingressive Aktionsart anzunehmen ist'. In Modern English there is a considerable difference between 'he began to wake up (to shout)' and 'he woke up (shouted)', and there is no reason to assume that this



difference did not exist in the language of *Havelok*. It, therefore, seems better to consider *bigan to wakne* and *bigan to grede* ingressive. Similarly *biginnen* in *Havelok* 739, 894, 2203, and 2647 does not seem to me to be pleonastic either, but ingressive. — p. 50. The preterite *with-drow* in 'With-drow þe knif', *Hav.* 498, strikes me as being effective, rather than ingressive.

p. 55. The Author remarks, "Woher *habban* seine perfectiven Bedeutungen ableitet, ist noch unklar." Old English *habban* frequently means 'to have acquired', especially in combinations like *bearn habban*, *cild habban*, *sige habban*. How *habban* became perfective in such collocations, is obvious enough.

One or two slight inaccuracies have drawn my attention.

p. 43 f. Four of the six examples quoted under *beoden* 1, and one of the two given under *beoden* 2 contain indubitable forms of *bidden*.

p. 73. That complete levelling of *þenchen* and *þunchen* became an accomplished fact in the thirteenth century is correct as far as the Northern dialect is concerned. In the Midlands and in the South the coalescence took place later.

p. 74 f. With two exceptions the examples given to illustrate *of-þenchen* belong to *ofþunchen*. The datives *þare quene*, *us*, etc. should have put the Author on his guard. That the meaning 'bereuen' developed from 'nicht gut dünken', 'missfallen', may be correct, but cannot be proved. Old English [*hit*] *me ofþynch* means not only 'it displeases, vexes, me', but also 'it grieves me', or rather 'it repents me', to quote an archaic construction.

The fact that Prof. Luick has accepted Dr. Häusermann's book for publication in the *Wiener Beiträge* hall-marks it as a work of sound scholarship. The quality guaranteed by the assay stamp is evinced on every page.

Amsterdam.

W. VAN DER GAAF.

*Sire Degarre*. Nach der gesamten Ueberlieferung und mit Untersuchungen über die Sprache und den Romanzenstoff herausgegeben von GUSTAV SCHLEICH. pp. 144. Englische Textbibliothek, 19. Heidelberg: Winter, 1929. RM. 7.50.

*Guy of Warwick*. Nach Coplands Druck zum ersten Male herausgegeben von GUSTAV SCHLEICH. pp. 274. Palaestra 139. Leipzig: Mayer und Müller, 1923.

Lysteneþ, lordinges, gent and fre!  
Ich wille zou telle of Sire Degarre.

In spite of the encouraging invitation, and the apparent enthusiasm with which the author unfolds his somewhat incoherent plot, the Romance of *Sire Degarre*, like some of the magazine-stories of today, makes one wonder if the 'lordinges' really enjoyed it, or if they had nothing better to read or hear. Dr. Schleich shows clearly and interestingly in his introduction (pp. 42-54) the various stock-elements which were woven together, with little skill and some discrepancies, in this story. (A recent study, by C. H. Slover in *Univ. of Texas*

*Studies in English*, 11, has further analysed the writer's method.) It is probably unfair in these times of economic strain to complain that the close printing of the introduction and notes, and the general appearance of the pages of the text, do not make the tale more attractive. Perhaps, as a story, it was really not worth a more enticing format.

The critical text is printed mainly from the Auchinleck MS., of the middle of the fourteenth century, with a few brief additions from the fifteenth century Cambridge MS. (these having their spelling adjusted to suit the normal usage of the Auchinleck MS.), and with the last 28 lines supplied from the Rawlinson MS. The variant readings of the other MSS. and early printed versions are given in footnotes. The introduction contains, in addition to the long section on the 'Romanzenstoff' already mentioned, a description of the MSS. and early printed texts in which the poem is found, a summary of the interrelationships of the MSS., etc. (in which the editor comes to the conclusion that Auchinleck stands apart from all the others now extant), and an account of the metre and dialect of the poem.

Dr. Schleich's summary of the chief dialectal features of the original (as suggested by rhymes), and his assignment of this original to the South-West Midland, are based on Morsbach's *Mittelenglische Grammatik*, and seem scarcely tenable (it is true that Dr. Schleich does not say what geographical area he means by S. W. Midland): for instance, the frequent *e* for O.E. *ȳ*, as well as *i*, in rhymes; the Present Participles in *-ende* (by the side of *-inde*), which are rare in the west; the absence of *o* before a nasal (unlengthened) in words such as *man* (though certainly this is rare south of Worcestershire); the rhymes of O.E. *eo* with *ē*. Dr. Schleich's reason for emending some of the scribe's idiosyncrasies is not very clear: e.g. he normalizes such forms as *schilde* to *child*, *souht* to *south*, *wizouten* to *wipouten*, etc., printing the emendation in italics. There are a few interesting spellings to be found: e.g. *rizte* (= *rit*) 'rides' 425.

The much longer tale of *Guy of Warwick* (7976 lines) has also been edited by Dr. Schleich, from the version printed by Copland, now reprinted for the first time since its first appearance between 1551 and 1561. Schleich suggests 1551 as the *terminus a quo*, on account of the 'earthquake', substituted in l. 5042 for the 'gret hete' of earlier versions, which may be an allusion to a shock felt in 'Rygate, Croydon and Darrkin' May 25, 1551.

The story, which is in rhymed couplets, follows the early versions, such as the Auchinleck and Cambridge MSS., fairly closely, and it includes the Reimbrun supplement, but there are a number of details (see pp. 269-70) which indicate that Copland's recension was not based on any one of the earlier forms now in existence. Copland's text has been followed throughout, emendations being made for the sake of the metre, and some (rather more regrettably) for the sake of producing eye-rhymes. As might be expected from a text printed so early, there are few interesting spellings.

We are grateful to Dr. Schleich for the patience and care with which he has prepared these two texts.

London.

MARY S. SERJEANTSON.

*Spenser and the Table Round.* A study in the Contemporaneous Background for Spenser's Use of the Arthurian Legend. By C. B. MILLICAN. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, vol. VIII.) ix + 237 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. London: Milford. 1932. 13s. net.

*Arthurian Legend in the Seventeenth Century.* By R. F. BRINKLEY. (Johns Hopkins Monographs in Literary History. No. III.) xi + 228 pp. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. \$ 2.—. London: Milford. 1932. 11s. net.

*Studies in Spenser's Historical Allegory.* By E. GREENLAW. (Johns Hopkins Monographs in Literary History, II.) ix + 220 pp. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press. \$ 2.—. London: Milford. 1932. 11s. net.

Of the three books under review, dealing with kindred subjects, the last mentioned seems to me the most important, though it is a posthumous publication which would probably have been improved in some respects, had the author been able to carry out the revision of the text which he had planned.

It contains four essays, two of which appeared in periodicals as far back as 1910 and 1912, while the other two are printed here for the first time, and it is these new and maturer studies that lend the volume its chief attraction. The first deals with the controversy which arose from the publication of Polydore Vergil's *History* and which professor Greenlaw has aptly named: "A sixteenth century Battle of the Books".

This Polydore Vergil — an Italian who came to England about 1501, attained high favour with Henry and was soon naturalised as a British subject — was a typical Renaissance scholar, who corresponded and quarrelled with Erasmus, and whose *History* was a remarkable achievement, in many respects superior to the chronicles that were written at the time. But there was one thing in his work that caused a good deal of indignation and made him suspect of being a traitor to his adopted country: he scornfully rejected Geoffrey of Monmouth's account of king Arthur and the Britons as mere legend and fancy. That in the 16th century there was a revival of interest in the Matter of Britain is well-known, but as professor Greenlaw and other writers have pointed out, it was an interest of a peculiarly limited character. The Elisabethans cared little or nothing for the stories about the quests of the knights, the romantic adventures; and when Ascham inveighed against "la Mort d'Arthur" he voiced the opinion of many humanists; they were inclined to look down upon the romances as poor, barbarous productions and moreover the "books of Chivalry" "were made in Monasteries by idle Monks or wanton Canons"; they smacked of Papistry and superstition. The Puritan dislike of romances sets in at a very early date.<sup>1</sup> But an exception was made for the personality of Arthur himself. On this the attention was entirely concentrated. The story took a national and political bias. Antiquaries tried to prove the historicity of Arthur, to strengthen the claims of the Tudors to the throne

<sup>1</sup> Cf. e.g. the curious note to the April eclogue of the *Shepherd's Calendar*: "... certain fine fablers and lowd lyers, such as were the Authors of King Arthur the great and such like", etc. See also Dr. 'E. v. d. Ven-ten Bensele, *The Character of King Arthur in Eng. Lit.*, Ch. VII and VIII.



by showing that with their accession the ancient prophecies had found their fulfilment.

Professor Greenlaw adduces the "Battle of the Books", of which he gives a very interesting account, as additional proof that this aspect of the Arthurian story was prominent in men's minds.

This political use of the legend is also the main theme of professor Millican's book, whereas professor Brinkley traces its influence in the 17th century, devotes an interesting part of her book to a discussion of Milton's attitude to the Arthurian legends and gives much attention to the intrinsically all but worthless epic of Sir Richard Blackmore, and to the work of some of Spenser's imitators: Jigon and Sheppard, which has never been published and exists only in manuscript. That Spenser himself took a keen interest in the matter, that he studied it closely and used it in the design of *The Faerie Queene*, about this there can be little doubt. Professor Greenlaw as well as professor Millican lay stress on the effect which the Arthurian material must have had on Spenser; their observations throw new light on certain aspects, though not on the most important aspects, of his great poem, and certainly contribute to a better understanding of the intended meaning of the historical allegory.

Professor Millican, whose book is adorned with several illustrations and facsimiles, has been at great pains to collect evidence of the existence of an "Arthurian ferment in connection with the Tudors". Following up some hints given by professor Greenlaw he has carefully studied the historical background and fully documented some points already indicated in the latter's work. His investigations are very interesting in themselves, especially his account of the society of archers under the leadership of prince Arthur, which existed in the reign of Henry VIII, the members of which called themselves by the names of well-known Arthurian knights. But however curious and interesting this evidence may be, the author seems to me to attach rather too much importance to it, as certainly does professor Brinkley who says that in the period of the Tudors the right to the throne of England depended upon the historicity of Arthur. This is going too far. It was chiefly the antiquaries and some literary men who occupied themselves with the matter and though the ruling powers of course welcomed any help that might substantiate their claims, it can hardly have been a crucial point in practical politics.

Even professor Greenlaw, the well-known Spenser-scholar, is occasionally, I think, inclined to exaggerate the importance of the influence of Arthur, but on the whole he is more guarded in his opinions, and in the excellent second essay in his book: "Elisabethan Fact and Modern Fancy," he has some very good and amusing things to say about the fanciful interpretations of certain literary historians, especially with regard to Shakespeare.

His work, like that of the other two authors under consideration, is based on careful historical research, but it is more lively and readable, it opens wider perspectives; in his books we find learning combined with nice judgement and imaginative understanding.

He contributed yet another book to the series (*Johns Hopkins Monographs on Literary History*), a book which has a much wider appeal than any of the three reviewed here: *The Province of Literary History*. I would strongly recommend it to all students. It is a very able defence of the claims of a historical study of literature as a useful and necessary supplement to æsthetic studies, it sets forth very clearly the aims and methods of research and incidentally the author makes in it many original and stimulating observations

on a host of writers, especially on Warton and Spenser, on Shakespeare, Shelley and Keats. In this book he has unconsciously indicated the difference between his own work and that of many other literary historians: "There are two kinds of research. Some of it is merely research. It digs up facts, some of which may be used by others. It may be as unintelligent as the garnering of observations by gardeners and common laborers by which the Royal Society, in its early days, set such store. It has the qualities of brick or stone, good building material, but lifeless. Other research glows with the personality of the man whose lifeblood it is. It is truly alive. Transmitted, it has power, as Bacon remarked of the mustard-seed, hastily to get up and spread." In several parts of his work professor Greenlaw has given us this 'other research'. But though his two fellow-workers in the field have not attained this high standard, I do not want to imply by my quotation that their work is lifeless or unintelligent. Far from it. Both writers (and especially professor Millican) have made valuable contributions to our knowledge of the period and our understanding of certain aspects of its literature. The passage quoted may only serve to indicate the general character of the difference between the work of a competent scholar and that of a versatile, more highly gifted master.

Delft.

A. G. VAN KRANENDONK.

*The Genesis of Shakespeare Idolatry, 1766-1799. A Study in English Criticism of the Late Eighteenth Century.* By R. W. BABCOCK, Ph. D. xxviii + 307 pp. Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press. 1931. Price \$ . 3.

A critic once declared that it was possible to judge the literary character of any age by its treatment of and attitude towards, Shakespeare. In the present work Dr. Babcock sets out to examine the fate of Shakespeare and his plays, both in the hands of the scholars and amongst the populace at large during the years 1766 to 1799, but incidentally also he has succeeded in revealing a great deal about the late eighteenth century itself. His object is to establish the thesis that that worship of Shakespeare for which the nineteenth century has become so notorious was no new thing, but developed, quite normally, from the idolatry of the last few decades of the eighteenth; and in so far as he has succeeded in this object, the book has accomplished its purpose. Of course, other scholars have already touched upon one or another aspect of the subject, notably Mr. E. Walder and Professor Nichol Smith; but Dr. Babcock has gone further than either of these. He has made a thorough investigation of his subject, and has tabulated a great deal of recondite material which should prove invaluable to the student of eighteenth-century literature.

The first chapter, a preliminary survey, is necessarily brief. It merely serves to show the antagonistic attitude of the early eighteenth century towards Shakespeare. "From 1660 to 1730 the traditional objections to Shakespeare generally held sway. That is, the critics castigated the poet for neglecting the unities, for ignoring the ancients, for violating decorum by resorting to tragic-comedy and supernatural characters, and for using puns and blank verse."

The last three decades of the century represent a reaction against this attitude, though even they, it appears, had not always a clear conscience when they criticised the Augustan age on the score of its ignorance, for in 1781 a certain Trinder actually reviewed a Shakespeare play as a new production of the season, while more than one critic confused lines from Otway with some of Shakespeare.

In his second chapter Dr. Babcock deals with the more scholarly approach to the plays, and it is here that the interesting facts begin to emerge. His researches have revealed no less than thirty-nine editions of the collected dramas during the period under review, and fourteen of individual plays, so that it was with some show of truth that, at the end of the century, *The Universal Magazine* could declare: "Were Shakespeare to re-visit this globe, the first thing that would surprise him would be, to learn that above one hundred and fifty thousand pounds have lately been devoted toward splendid editions of his works." Then there were eleven different publications dealing with the Shakespeare canon, while seven glossaries or concordances had also made their appearance. Of course, all were not of equal value (and one feels that it is a pity that Dr. Babcock, after taking the trouble to amass so much material, has not given any indication of their relative merits as works of scholarship); but scholarly or otherwise, they show the growing interest in all aspects of Shakespeare's work. And it is the same with the biographies. Of the four which appeared during this period, Malone's is, without doubt, the most important, and in view of this one would have thought it merited a detailed discussion; as it is, our author dismisses it merely by remarking that it is a work of minute scholarship, a statement much too vague to have any value as criticism.

On the various *Lives* of Shakespeare Dr. Babcock has little to give us beyond tables and statistics; but the section on the fictitious biographies, particularly the Ireland forgeries, is more illuminating, and deserves careful study. The origin, history, and exposure of these forgeries are set out more clearly than ever they have been before.

The third section of the book examines the popular interest in Shakespeare, and here again the author's investigations have produced interesting and important results. He has shown, for instance, that by 1793 editors could tabulate seventy re-worked versions of the dramas, involving thirty-one plays, all of them between 1673 and 1800; that forty-two operas based on Shakespeare were produced, and that sixteen of these were adaptations of *The Tempest*. The period between 1769 and 1781 saw five Shakespeare jubilees, while the first public lecture on Shakespeare was given by William Kenrick on January 19, 1774. The significance of this lecture has already been stressed by Professor Nichol Smith in his book, *Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century*, so that those who have read that work or were privileged to hear the lectures on which it was based, will not need to be reminded of it again. But Dr. Babcock has shown what Professor Nichol Smith omitted to show — that this lecture was really called forth by a double circumstance: the appearance of Steevens' edition of the plays, and the publication of a "mutilated playhouse copy", probably one of those included in Bell's *British Theatre*.

Here, then, we see the growth of Shakespeare idolatry during the years 1766 to 1799 among both the populace and the scholars. But there is one curious omission. Dr. Babcock fails to give us any indication of the popularity of these pieces as stage-plays. An examination of the handlists to Professor



Allardyce Nicoll's histories of the drama, or, better still, of the manuscript records of London theatrical performances which Professor Nicoll has at the East London College, would have thrown a good deal of light upon this subject.

With the fourth and fifth chapters we move on to a study of the attitude of the critics, and it is here more clearly than anywhere else that the genesis of the nineteenth-century position is discernible. Practically every charge which the Restoration and the Augustans brought against Shakespeare, this age set itself to rebut. There were, for instance, no less than six books written in these thirty-three years to justify him in his violation of the unities, while Farmer, wishing to give all honour that he could to the poet, submitted that he was totally ignorant of the classics and relied for his knowledge of Roman history and mythology upon translations. Immediately he was attacked by George Coleman, who accused him of drawing conclusions from unconvincing evidence; but more and more Farmer's theory found acceptance. A century earlier it would have damned Shakespeare: now it showed that he was possessed of an "original genius".

In his treatment of this question of Shakespearean criticism, we have to thank Dr. Babcock for one thing above all else: he has removed Johnson from the position which he has usurped for so long, and has restored the minor critics to their proper eminence. For though undoubtedly Johnson's was an important contribution, his pre-eminence in other fields has led historians to over-rate its value and significance. Actually, so far as Shakespearean studies are concerned, he was anticipated by Kames, and before the end of the century was followed by some six or seven writers who all had their influence and made their own contributions. Johnson was merely one among several, and quite unjustifiably, as Dr. Babcock thinks, "has somewhat over-shadowed the contributions of other critics during the period. More credit for aiding the general reaction should now be given to the various periodicals, and perhaps also certain other prominent individual critics of the period should be emphasised — notably Mrs. Montague, Morgann, and Mrs. Griffith."

Three other important aspects of Shakespeare are also treated by Dr. Babcock. First of all there is the question of his poetry. The eulogy of the poetic passages in the plays increased until it grew fulsome, while anthologies of "the beauties of Shakespeare" abounded. This, the author might have pointed out, marks the beginning of that so-called criticism which found its ultimate expression in Lamb, Coleridge, and Hazlitt, and did so much to undermine the drama of the nineteenth century: I refer to the tendency to pick out "purple passages", irrespective of their dramatic merits, and hold them up as examples of Shakespeare at his best. There can, I think, be little doubt, that had it not been for the work of the eighteenth century in paving the way, we should never have had the *Specimens of the English Dramatic Poets*.

Secondly there was the comparatively new type of criticism which addressed itself to the appreciation of individual characters. This, again, had its development in the next age, for on its more scholarly level, as represented in Maurice Morgann's essay on *The Dramatic Character of Sir John Falstaff*, it led to the modern and scientific studies of men like Stopford Brooke, A. C. Bradley, Edward Dowden, and, in our own day, E. E. Stoll. But in its sentimentalised vein (and it must be confessed that a great deal of it was of this type) it paved the way for the florid effusions of Mrs. Jameson.

Finally there was what Mr. Babcock terms the growing school of psychological criticism. In the present work, unfortunately, it is given but summary

treatment, but it was probably the most important of all the achievements of the eighteenth century in the field of Shakespearean scholarship. In its own age, with Maurice Morgann and William Richardson as its two chief exponents, it shocked orthodox opinion much as the Higher Criticism of the Bible has shocked a certain school of religious opinion in our own day; but its effect was lasting. "Why, sir", exclaimed Johnson in reference to Morgann, "we shall have the man come forth again; and as he has proved Falstaff to be no coward, he may prove Iago to be a very good character". One wonders what would have been the Doctor's opinion of our modern criticism, which casts doubt on the virtue of Ophelia, idealises Jaques, and makes a hero of Shylock.

Though he traces this psychologising process back to the influence of Hume, Dr. Babcock finds the first example of psychological analysis and criticism in Kames' *Elements of Criticism* (1762). But personally I should be inclined to put it several years earlier, in Colley Cibber's *Apology*. One has but to compare Cibber's description of Betterton's Hamlet with Pilon's picture of Henderson in the same rôle (which our author quotes on page 174 of his work) to find grounds for the ascription.

It is obvious that a great deal of patient research has gone to the making of this book, which is a mine of information on its subject. The documentations, the footnotes and the appendices should prove of incalculable value; but it is regrettable that a number of errors and stylistic faults have crept in. On page 84 we read of an alterer of Shakespeare's plays (surely not yet an accepted English word), while page 228 gives a strange example of a transitive use of the verb "to wish": "specialists may wish a few clues" etc. Another disconcerting habit of Dr. Babcock is to give merely the initials of writers who are more familiar to us by their full names. E. Young and F. Gentleman, for instance, would be much more easily recognisable as Edward Young and Francis Gentleman, while the T. Mathias of page 182 is usually known as T. J. Mathias. But worst of all, Colley Cibber has actually been credited with a *King Lear* (p. 87); presumably either Tate's *Lear* or Cibber's *Richard III* is meant.

Sheffield.

FREDERICK T. WOOD.

*L'idée de l'Art pour l'Art dans la Littérature Anglaise pendant la Période Victorienne.* Par LOUISE ROSENBLATT. Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée, Tome 70. Paris, Champion 1931. 328 p.

Le sujet de ce livre ressemble singulièrement à celui de M. A. J. Farmer, *Le Mouvement esthétique et décadent en Angleterre*, tome 75 de la même collection, paru la même année 1931, dont j'ai fait ici-même une analyse fort développée (en décembre 1931). Grâce à ces deux livres, voici, décidément, une question vidée.

Je serai plus bref cette fois, non pas que l'ouvrage soit inférieur. Moins confiné que M. Farmer dans l'histoire littéraire et la littérature comparée, l'auteur fait preuve d'un esprit large et synthétique. Les deux ouvrages diffèrent d'ailleurs par la proportion accordée aux diverses périodes.

Les 33 pages de M. Farmer sur les *Origines* du Mouvement (Keats, Ruskin, les Préraphaélites, Swinburne) deviennent 167 pages chez Louise Rosenblatt. Au lieu de commencer à la Révolte contre l'attitude victorienne, l'auteur brosse d'abord sa *Toile de Fond*, qui peint l'attitude victorienne elle-même. Elle étudie ensuite la *Voie préparée* (Leigh Hunt et Keats), la *Défense du Beau* (Ruskin et les Préraphaélites) et, au chapitre IV seulement, la *Révolte esthétique*, c'est-à-dire Swinburne.

Après une préface où elle se défend de faire un plaidoyer en faveur de L'Art pour l'Art, Louise Rosenblatt montre, d'après la thèse de A. Cassagne, *La Théorie de l'Art pour l'Art en France* (1906) que l'opinion publique en France, avant Gautier et Baudelaire (lui-même influencé, par Edgar Poe) n'était pas si avancée qu'on pourrait le croire. Je rappelle à ce propos la condamnation de *Madame Bovary* par le Tribunal de la Seine en 1857.

En Angleterre, il se forme, après 1830, une mentalité indifférente ou hostile à l'art. Le tempérament "respectable" ou bourgeois de l'âge victorien est foncièrement anti-esthétique. L'auteur le prouve en dépouillant les grandes revues qui de 1850 à 1870 se font les avocates du public contre les artistes. La *London Quarterly Review* en 1854 s'élève contre l'exhibition de statues nues. La *Saturday Review*, en 1859, reproche à Meredith (à propos de *The Ordeal of Richard Feverel*, je suppose ?) de n'inculquer aucune leçon morale. Le même journal, en 1860, découvre des éléments "pénibles et déplaisants" dans *The Mill on the Floss*. La *Contemporary Review* en 1867 considère comme des révoltés non seulement Swinburne, mais George Eliot, Charles Reade, Carlyle ! (37).

Ce puritanisme se traduisait encore par une condamnation de la littérature française contemporaine "que l'on retrouve d'ailleurs chez A. Vinet." Louise Rosenblatt n'ignore pas, sans doute, que Vinet était protestant et suisse.

Carlyle "appuyait de son éloquence inspirée et de son zèle prophétique la conviction générale de son temps que la littérature devait instruire et édifier." Je signale ici le jugement de Thackeray sur "l'impureté, la corruption latente" de Sterne dans ses *Essays on English Humorists*. Matthew Arnold, "malgré son ton moralisant, dépassait son temps" par ses attaques contre les "philistins" et son plaidoyer pour le "désintéressement" de la critique. Mais enfin la Poésie fut toujours pour lui *A criticism of life*, non pas seulement "an expression of life" et je lui pardonne difficilement son "*ineffectual angel*" à propos de Shelley et son "*underbred tone*" à propos des lettres d'amour de Keats.

L'auteur nous montre dans *La Voie préparée* que les premiers concepts favorables à l'art pour l'art vinrent d'Allemagne, par Crabb Robinson, élève de Schelling, par Coleridge, qui affirmait, après Kant, que "la poésie et l'art se proposent comme objet immédiat le plaisir, non la vérité" (*Biog. Literaria*). Les critiques romantiques, Hazlitt, Leigh Hunt, auront donc le désir d'apprécier plutôt que de juger. Hunt félicite en Keats un poète *revelling in real poetry for its own sake* (72). Keats est évidemment le modèle de l'homme qui considère l'art comme une fin en soi. Ses vers les plus caractéristiques influencèrent A. Hallam, l'ami de Tennyson. Il déclare : "Chaque fois que l'activité se laisse absorber par un motif autre que le *désir de beauté*, le résultat artistique est faux" (85). De pareils documents, comme aussi les essais critiques d'Alex. Smith (1830 à 1867) prouvent, dit l'auteur, que le point de vue de l'art pour l'art aurait pu naître, à la rigueur, "de la tradition romantique anglaise, non renforcée par des influences étrangères". (85)

Viennent ensuite le rôle de Ruskin ou "la réaction contre la laideur," le



rôle des Préraphaélites qui reprennent l'héritage de Keats, et enfin "La Révolte", — Swinburne.

Un livre comme celui-ci veut être complet et par conséquent, sur l'histoire du Mouvement préraphaélite par exemple, répète des choses connues. Mais Louise Rosenblatt est si bien "au courant" qu'elle parvient à donner quelques détails nouveaux (grâce aux documents et recherches de T. J. Wise) sur l'histoire de la publication des *Poems and Ballads* par exemple.

L'auteur cite une conférence sur Swinburne (1925) où Harold Nicholson prétend que "le goût de Swinburne pour les thèmes exotiques et pervers provient, comme chez Baudelaire, d'un état pathologique." Louise Rosenblatt croit (et j'en tombe d'accord) que ce goût provenait au moins autant "du besoin de révolte, du désir de réagir contre les attitudes contemporaines envers la morale et l'art."

Louise Rosenblatt et A. J. Farmer se rejoignent devant Walter Pater et marchent quelque temps de front. Le titre même de ce chapitre, *Le Mysticisme esthétique*, indique une tendance à la psychologie. L'auteur pénètre dans la conscience de Walter Pater et montre comment le sentiment religieux déçu se transforme chez lui en une religion de l'art qui devient une philosophie de l'existence. Pater ne va pas jusqu'à faire de l'art une révélation de la vérité spirituelle (comme Hegel), et la "morale supérieure de l'art" consiste surtout pour lui dans le "désintéressement" de l'artiste. Il doit d'ailleurs beaucoup à Hegel, notamment cette idée que tout art aspire aux conditions de la musique, c'est à dire à la fusion totale de la matière et de la forme. Il est vrai que plus tard il distinguera entre "le bon art" et "le grand art", la "grandeur" dépendant du contenu spirituel. Mais ceci n'est pas en contradiction avec le culte de la forme auquel il restera fidèle jusque dans son roman posthume, inachevé, *Gaston de Latour*, que l'auteur n'analyse pas, comme le fait M. Farmer.

Une nouveauté proposée par Louise Rosenblatt, c'est l'influence qu'aurait eu Swinburne sur Pater, par son *William Blake*, après 1868. Dans l'essai *Leonardo da Vinci* de Pater, l'auteur découvre des traces de la méthode critique et même de "la prose" de Swinburne. Sur le dernier point, je ferais des réserves. Il peut y avoir des ressemblances de vocabulaire, des épithètes communes ça et là, mais la prose oratoire de Swinburne n'en reste pas moins éloignée de la manière introspective de Pater.

Le chapitre VI, *Le Romancier artiste*, correspond au chapitre de M. Farmer sur George Moore. L'auteur ne parle plus seulement de Moore, mais de William James et de R. L. Stevenson. Elle montre la "Convergence de l'Art pour l'Art avec les défenses du roman réaliste," c'est à dire que Thomas Hardy par exemple et W. James (dans *The Art of Fiction*, en 1884) réclament le droit, pour le roman artiste, de représenter toute la vie sans enseigner la morale. De plus W. James établit, dans *The Author of Beltraffio* (1884), qu'il existe une morale spéciale des artistes, un devoir, une responsabilité devant son œuvre, qui peut contrarier les goûts du public. Même idée chez R. L. Stevenson, dans *The Morality of the Profession of Letters* (l'auteur, p. 236, néglige d'indiquer la date). Seulement Stevenson, admettant que le public a le droit de ne pas payer des œuvres qui l'offensent, évite les conflits et "se réfugie dans le romanque." On voudrait souscrire au jugement de l'auteur, que leurs doctrines ont permis à ces hommes "le souci de la structure, les qualités architectoniques du roman." Mais je continue à trouver des longueurs, des hors d'œuvre, dans les romans de W. James, dans *The Master of Ballantrae* de Stevenson et chez les romanciers plus récents, sauf quelques exceptions.

Le soin de la "forme" a porté sur le style. L'intensité de vie reste le *fort*, l'architecture, le *faible* du roman anglais.

A la *Deuxième Partie* de M. Farmer (250 pages) répond un seul chapitre (de 50 pages) sur la *Fin du siècle* ou Oscar Wilde et ses contemporains. Louise Rosenblatt est donc ici moins riche. Pourtant elle dit l'essentiel, ce qui prouve que la plupart des livres sont trop longs. Chez Wilde, la forme est tout et l'art devient "supérieur à la vie." Cette fois, l'auteur prend position, juge moralement et socialement : "L'autonomie de l'art qui avait été revendiquée dans des conditions différentes par les philosophes allemands, fut proclamée dans la seconde moitié du siècle par des hommes pour qui la vie elle-même n'avait pas d'unité intelligible." (265). Le mot *Décadence* n'est pas déplacé pour autant que la doctrine, artificielle, sépare l'art de la vie.

L'auteur a quelques observations intéressantes sur le rapprochement de la littérature avec les arts plastiques et la musique (illustré notamment par Arthur Symons) et sur le poète Yeats qui malgré son ardent patriotisme, fidèle à la doctrine, refuse de mettre son art au service de la "cause" irlandaise.

Dans sa Conclusion, l'auteur montre que le principe de l'Art pour l'Art, malgré ses exagérations passagères, a vaincu et méritait de vaincre. Le fait que la censure intervient parfois "pour protéger le lecteur moyen contre l'artiste" n'enlève rien à sa validité. Certes il y eut des malentendu provenant de ce que la théorie fut à certains moments une révolte contre le code moral et social lui-même. Certes on a tendu par moments à créer une conception artificielle du Beau "comme un absolu entièrement distinct des autres sentiments" (310) mais cette outrance n'a point prévalu et plutôt que de vouloir un art séparé de la vie, on a voulu que toute la vie pût servir à l'art. Bernard Shaw lui-même, dont l'art est un enseignement, revendique le droit pour l'artiste d'exprimer des choses que la société peut désapprouver. Il est d'accord sur ce point avec les partisans de l'Art pour l'Art. "Il n'a pas les mêmes amis," dit Yeats, "mais il a les mêmes ennemis."

Au sens large, le principe ne bannit pas le "contenu moral" pourvu qu'on transpose la morale dans le domaine esthétique. Et le critique peut en tenir compte; seulement, comme le dit T. S. Eliot dans *A Dialogue on Poetic Drama* (1928, cité p. 306) "le critique doit s'apercevoir quand il cesse de porter des jugements artistiques et s'abandonne à des considérations morales."

Bruxelles.

PAUL DE REUL.

## Bibliography.

### HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM.

[18<sup>th</sup> Century and After.]

*Der psychologische Gehalt in den Romanen Defoes.* Von P. VAN BEECK. 8<sup>o</sup>. pp. 68. Quakenbrück: Kleinert 1931. (Phil. Diss. Münster).

*Das Prometheusymbol von Shaftesbury zu Goethe.* Von OSC. WALZEL. 2. Aufl. in neuer Bearb. gr. 8<sup>o</sup>. pp. 109. München: Hueber, 1932. = Wortkunst. N. F. H. 7. RM. 4.25.

*Allan Ramsay. A Study of his Life and Works.* By BURNS MARTIN. 7<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> × 5<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>. vii. + 203 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: Milford. 11s. 6d. n.

*The Ballad of Tradition.* By GORDON HALL GEROULD. 9 × 6, viii. + 311 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 12s. 6d. n. [A review will appear.]

*Literarische Einflüsse in Schottischen Volksballaden.* Versuch einer kritischen Variantenvergleichung. Von G. HUMBERT. [Studien zur engl. Philologie, herausg. von Morsbach und Hecht, LXXIV.] 117 pp. Halle, Niemeyer, 1932. RM. 4.50 [A review will appear.]

*Bischof Percy's Bearbeitung der Volksballaden und Kunstgedichte seines Folio-Manuskriptes.* Von M. WILLINSKY. (Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, herausg. von Max Förster. Heft XXII.) 227 pp. Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1932. RM. 10.—. [A review will appear.]

*Die Philosophie Fieldings.* Von M. JOESTEN. (Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten, 15. Band.) 106 pp. Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1932. RM. 5.—. [A review will appear.]

*Henry Fielding's Theory of the Comic Prose Epic.* By E. M. THORNBURY. (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, no. 30.) 202 pp. Madison, 1931. Price? [A review will appear.]

*Samuel Johnson als Kritiker im Lichte von Pseudo-Klassizismus und Romantik.* Von S. CHRISTIANI. (Beiträge zur engl. Philologie, herausg. von Max Förster, XVIII.) 120 pp. Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1931. Broschiert M. 5.40, geheftet M. 9.— [A review will appear.]

*Some Unpublished Letters to and from Dr. Johnson.* From the Originals now in the Possession of the John Rylands Library. Edited by J. D. WRIGHT. Reprinted, with considerable additions, from "The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library," Vol. XVI., No. 1, January, 1932. 10½ × 6¾, 55 pp. Manchester: University Press. 2s. n.

*Three Dialogues by Hester Lynch Thrale.* From the hitherto unpublished Original Manuscript now in the Possession of the John Rylands Library. Edited, with an Introduction, by M. ZAMICK. Reprinted from "The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library," Vol. XVI., No. 1, January, 1932. 10½ × 6¾, 40 pp. Manchester: University Press. 1s. 6d. n.

*Charles and Fanny Burney in the Light of the New Thrale Correspondence in the John Rylands Library.* By W. WRIGHT ROBERTS. Reprinted from "The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library," Vol. XVI., No. 1, January, 1932. 10½ × 6¾, 24 pp. Manchester: University Press. 1s. 6d. n.

*Johnson and Queeney.* Letters from Dr. Johnson to Queeney Thrale. From the Bowood Papers. Edited with an Introduction by the MARQUIS OF LANSDOWNE. 9 × 5¼, xxxv. + 64 pp. Cassell. 45s. n.

*Anecdotes of Samuel Johnson.* By HESTHER LYNCH PIOZZI. Edited with an Introduction by S. C. ROBERTS. 7 × 4¼, xxx. + 196 pp. (Cambridge Miscellany.) Cambridge University Press. 3s. 6d. n.

First published in 1924.

*The French Journals of Mrs. Thrale and Doctor Johnson.* Edited from the Original Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library and in the British Museum, with Introduction and Notes by MOSES TYSON and HENRY GUPPY. 9 × 6, xi. + 274 pp. Manchester: The University and John Rylands Library. 15s. n.

*Observations on some Tendencies of Sentiment and Ethics chiefly in Minor Poetry and Essay in the Eighteenth Century until the Execution of Dr. W. Dodd in 1777.* By J. H. HARDER, 320 pp. Amsterdam, Drukkerij Portielje, 1933.

Diss. Amsterdam.

*An Investigation into the Character of Fanny Burney.* By A. A. OVERMAN. 221 pp. Amsterdam, H. J. Paris, 1933. Price f 3.40. [A review will appear.]

Diss. Amsterdam.

*The Life of William Beckford.* By J. W. OLIVER. 8½ × 6, x. + 343 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 12s. 6d. n.

*Gibbon.* By G. M. YOUNG. 7¾ × 5¼, 182 pp. Peter Davies, 5s. n.

*The Letters of Philip Dormer Stanhope, Fourth Earl of Chesterfield.* Edited, with an Introduction, by BONAMY DOBRÉE. In Six Volumes. 9¼ × 6¼. Vol. I.: Introduction, Index, &c. xxx. + 338 pp. Vol. II.: Letters, 1712-1745. 602 pp. Vol. III.: Letters, 1745-1748. pp. 603-1194. Vol. IV.: Letters, 1748-1751. pp. 1195-1792. Vol. V.: Letters, 1751-1761. pp. 1793-2382. Vol. VI.: Letters, 1761-1773. Appendices. pp. 2383-2968. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 12 guineas net set of six volumes.



*The Blecheley Diary of The Rev. William Cole, 1765-67.* Edited from the original MS. in the British Museum by FRANCIS GRIFFIN STOKES. With an Introduction by HELEN WADDELL.  $9 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , ix. + 392 pp. Constable. 16s. n.

*Warburton and the Warburtonians.* A Study in some Eighteenth-century Controversies. By A. W. EVANS.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$ , viii. + 315 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 15s. n.

*The Correspondence of Richard Hurd and William Mason.* And Letters of Richard Hurd to Thomas Gray. With Introduction and Notes by the late ERNEST HAROLD PEARCE, D.D. Edited with additional Notes by LEONARD WHIBLEY.  $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , xxxi. + 179 pp. Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d. n.

*The Popular Novel in England, 1770-1800.* By J. M. S. TOMPKINS.  $9 \times 6$ , xi. + 388 pp. Constable. 12s. 6d. n.

*The Life of Robert Burns.* By FRANKLYN BLISS SNYDER.  $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ , xiv. + 524 pp. Macmillan Company. 18s. n.

*The Romantic Quest.* By H. N. FAIRCHILD. viii. + 444 pp. New York, Columbia University Press; London, Milford. 1931. 30/- net. [A review will appear.]

*Wordsworth and Literary Criticism.* By J. A. CHAPMAN. The Russell Lecture, 1931. Delivered at Patna College on the 10th December, 1931.  $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , 28 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 1s. 6d. n.

*Einheit und Totalität bei Wordsworth unter dem Gesichtspunkt psychologischer Strukturtheorie.* Von E. SCHUMACHER. gr. 8<sup>o</sup> 88 pp. Phil. Diss. Marburg. 1931.

*Unpublished Letters of Samuel Taylor Coleridge.* Including certain letters republished from original sources. Edited by EARL LESLIE GRIGGS. In Two Volumes.  $9 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ . Vol. I, xxii. + 460. Vol. II, 476 pp. Constable, 37s. 6d. n. the two volumes.

*Coleridge und die Kantische Philosophie.* Erste Einwirkungen des deutschen Idealismus in England. Von E. WINKELMANN. (Palaestra 184.) xii + 258 pp. Leipzig, Mayer & Müller, 1933. M. 14.80. [A review will appear.]

*The Gold-Headed Cane.* By WILLIAM MACMICHAEL. Edited with Explanatory and Illustrative Notes and Essay on William MacMichael, M.D. His Life, His Works and His Editors, by HERBERT SPENCER ROBINSON. Containing the Original Illustrations of the 1828 Edition and hitherto Unpublished Portraits of the MacMichael Family and a Reproduction of William MacMichael's Handwriting.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$ , xxxi. + 223 pp. New York: Froben Press. \$3.50. [A review will appear.]

*Jane Austen's Letters.* Collected and Edited by R. W. CHAPMAN. In Two Volumes.  $9\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ . Vol. I. xlviii + 266 pp. and Notes. Vol. II. xxxii. pp. + pp. 267-510, and Notes and Index. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 42s. n. the two volumes.

*The Life of Sir Walter Scott.* By STEPHEN GRAHAM. Centenary Edition.  $9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , 384 pp. Thornton Butterworth. 7s. 6d. n.

First published in 1930 at 15s.

*Sir Walter Scott.* By JOHN BUCHAN.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ , 387 pp. Cassell. 9s. 6d. n.

*Sir Walter Scott To-Day.* Some Retrospective Essays and Studies. Edited for the Edinburgh Centenary Committee, by H. J. C. GRIERSON.  $9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , xviii. + 188 pp. Constable. 10s. 6d. n.

*Scott Centenary Articles.* Essays by THOMAS SECCOMBE, W. P. KER, GEORGE GORDON, W. H. HUTTON, ARTHUR MCDOWALL, and R. S. RAIT.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 202 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 7s. 6d. n.

*The Waverley Pageant.* The Best Passages from the Novels of SIR WALTER SCOTT, Selected, with Critical Introduction by HUGH WALPOLE, with Notes by WILFRED PARTINGTON.  $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , xi. + pp. 19-662. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 8s. 6d. n.

*Sir Walter's Post-Bag.* More Stories and Sidelights from his unpublished Letter-Books. Written and Selected by WILFRED PARTINGTON. Foreword by HUGH WALPOLE. With a Record of Scott's Correspondents.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , xvii. + 402 pp. John Murray. 16s. n.

*Some Unpublished Letters of Sir Walter Scott.* From the Collection in the Brotherton Library. Compiled by J. ALEXANDER SYMINGTON.  $10\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$ , xix. + 195 pp. Oxford: Blackwell. 10s. 6d. n.

*The Letters of Sir Walter Scott. 1787-1807.* Edited by H. J. C. GRIERSON, assisted by D. Cook, Wm. Parker and others. Centenary Edition. Vol. I, xcv + 531 pp.; Vol. II, xv + 544 pp.; Vol. III, xv + 542 pp. London, Constable, 1932. 18/- net each volume. [See Leading Article.]

*Religious Creeds and Philosophies as represented by characters in Sir Walter Scott's works and biography.* By K. BOS. XIII + 291 pp. Amsterdam, H. J. Paris, 1932. Diss. Amsterdam.

*Quellenuntersuchungen zu Walter Scotts Romanen „The Monastery“ und „The Abbot.“* Von B. KOTHEN. 8<sup>o</sup>. 70 pp. Phil. Diss. München 1931.

*Das Verhältniss von Bürgers lyrischer und episch-lyrischer Dichtung zur englischen Literatur.* Von F. BLÖMKER. gr. 8<sup>o</sup>. 84 pp. Phil. Diss. Münster 1930.

*Byron and the Need of Fatality.* By CHARLES DU BOS. Translated by ETHEL COLBURN MAYNE. 8<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> × 5<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, 283 pp. Putnam. 10s. 6d. n.

*The Life and Letters of Anne Isabella, Lady Noel Byron.* From unpublished papers in the possession of the late Ralph, Earl of Lovelace. By ETHEL COLBURN MAYNE. With an Introduction and Epilogue by MARY, COUNTESS OF LOVELACE. Second Edition. 9 × 6, xvi. + 502 pp. Constable. 7s. 6d. n.

First published in 1929 at 21s.

*Desire and Restraint in Shelley.* By FLOYD STOVALL. 9<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> × 6, ix. + 308 pp. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press. London: Cambridge University Press. 20s. n.

*Lamb Before Elia.* By F. V. MORLEY. 8<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> × 5<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, 320 pp. Jonathan Cape. 10s. 6d. n.

*Aug. Wilh. Schlegels Einfluss auf William Hazlitt als Shakespeare-Kritiker.* Von G. SCHNÖCKELBORG. 8<sup>o</sup>. 55 pp. Phil. Diss. Münster 1930.

*Goethe und Grossbritannien.* Von WILH. VOLLRATH. 8<sup>o</sup>. pp. 73. Erlangen: Palm & Enke 1932. RM. 1.80.

*Carlyle.* By EMERY NEFF. 8<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> × 5<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, 282 pp. Allen und Unwin. 10s. 6d. n.

*Carlyle und die deutsche Romantik.* Von K. LOTTER. gr. 8<sup>o</sup>. pp. 75. Nürnberg: Spindler 1931. RM. 2.—

*Landmarks in the History of Education.* 7<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> × 5<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>. Herbert Spencer on Education. Edited by F. A. CAVENAGH. xxxiii. + 233 pp. *Culture and Anarchy.* By MATTHEW ARNOLD. Edited with an Introduction by J. DOVER WILSON. xl. + 241 pp. Cambridge University Press. 6s. n. each. [See Review, Febr. 1933.]

*Matthew Arnolds politische Grundanschauungen.* Von O. ELIAS. 8<sup>o</sup>. pp. 152. Leipzig: Mayer & Müller. 1931 = Palaestra 175. (Auch Phil. Diss. Berlin.)

*The Reception of English Literature in Germany.* By L. M. PRICE. x + 596 pp. University of California Press, Berkeley, California, 1932. \$6.50. [A review will appear.]

*John Clare: A Life.* By J. W. and ANNE TIBBLE. 9 × 6, 468 pp. Cobden-Sanderson. 21s. n.

*The Great Victorians.* Edited by H. J. MASSINGHAM and HUGH MASSINGHAM. 8<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> × 5<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, xx. + 556 pp. Ivor Nicholson and Watson. 8s. 6d. n.

*Macaulay.* By ARTHUR BRYANT. 7<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> × 5<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, 190 pp. Peter Davies. 5s. n.

*Studien zu Dickens Roman: Barnaby Rudge.* Von A. ULRICH. Phil. Diss. Jena. 1931.

*Dickens to his Oldest Friend.* The Letters of a Lifetime from Charles Dickens to Thomas Beard. Edited by WALTER DEXTER. 9 × 6, xxiv + 296 pp. Putnam. 21s. n.

*Thackeray. A Personality.* By MALCOLM ELWIN. 9 × 6, 410 pp. Jonathan Cape. 12s. 6d. n.

*Die Erzählkunst in Thackeray's „Vanity Fair.“* Von L. BAUCKE. (Britannica, herausg. von Emil Wolff, 4.) XII + 187 pp. Hamburg, Friederichsen, de Gruyter & Co., 1932. RM. 8.—. [A review will appear.]

## What is Phonology ?

Students of English have been accustomed to understand by the term *phonology* what German linguists call „historische Lautlehre“, i.e. that part of historical grammar which deals with the development of the sounds (and sound-attributes, as quantity, stress etc.) of a given language. By others, again, the terms phonology and phonetics were regarded as synonyms, and no noticeable difference of meaning between them was thought of.

Neither of these two meanings of the term phonology, of course, is identical with what is understood by it by a group of linguists concentrated especially in the Cercle Linguistique de Prague, and it is only to warn against incorrect associations that they have been mentioned here. Phonology, as we shall deal with it and as it is understood by the group of linguists just referred to, is “that part of linguistics which deals with phonic phenomena of speech with regard to their respective functions” (see *TCLP* IV, p. 309).

The definition just quoted shows at the same time where the fundamental difference between phonetics and phonology is to be looked for. It is not a difference of the material examined, but of two ways in which it is examined, of two diverse standpoints from which light is thrown upon it. Phoneticians have, up to the present day, examined the phonic aspect of human speech from its physiological, organogenetic, acoustic or psychological side, but they have, for the most part, failed to realize that all phonic facts must be regarded as functional elements of the language in question, i.e. that use is made of them by that language for expressing various functions, i.e. various tasks which the language has to fulfil, esp. the communicative function, the emotional function etc. Now it is exactly the phonologists who try to observe phonic phenomena with a continual and consistent regard to their rôles in the language. An example of how this is done will show us some facts of fundamental importance which remain concealed to the investigation of a purely phonetic nature.

Phonetic descriptions of English, enumerating the sounds occurring in that language, mention the two *n*-like consonants existing in English, namely the alveolar (or dental) *n*, as in the words *no*, *never*, *thin*, and the velar (or back) *ŋ*, as in the words *thing*, *wrong* etc. Phonetic descriptions of, e.g., Spanish, Italian, Czech and Hungarian would inform us that both *n*-like sounds exist also in these languages. By ascertaining this fact of phonetic coincidence between English and the other languages the work of the phonetician comes to an end. A phonologist, however, proceeds further, and asks how the two *n*-like sounds are utilized in the languages mentioned here.

A closer investigation of this matter shows him that the functional rôle of the two consonants in English is quite different from the one fulfilled by them in Spanish, Italian, Czech and Hungarian (and, of course, in many other languages). There exist, namely, some pairs of words of different meaning in English the phonic structure of which is the same, the difference *n/ŋ* excepted (*bin* : *biŋ*, *kin* : *kiŋ*, *ræn* : *ræŋ* etc.), so that this single phonic difference becomes closely associated with difference of meaning in English, i.e. the difference between the English sounds *n* and *ŋ* is recognized as capable of distinguishing words in English, as functionally relevant in that language.



In Spanish, Italian, Czech and Hungarian, on the other hand, no pairs of words can be found in which the difference of meaning would be solely owing to the phonic difference between the sounds *n* and *ŋ*. The velar nasal consonant *ŋ*, namely, does not occur in these languages except before velar consonants, where alveolar *n* is never found, in other positions it is, on the contrary, only the alveolar *n* which may be found there, and the back *ŋ* which never occurs. The two sounds *n* and *ŋ* being thus mutually exclusive as to their respective positions in Sp., It., Cz. and Hg., they cannot be used for distinguishing words in those languages, and, therefore, the phonic difference between them cannot be associated with difference of meaning, i.e. the said difference is functionally irrelevant in Sp., It., Cz. and Hg.

In other words, we may say that the sounds *n* and *ŋ* belong to one functional unit in Sp., It., Cz. and Hg., but that they represent two separate functional units in English. A functional unit like this being called a *phoneme* by phonologists, we may say that the sounds *n* and *ŋ* constitute two separate phonemes in English, but a single phoneme in the other languages mentioned.

If a phonetician wishes to indicate by a graphic scheme the repertory of sounds in Sp., It., Cz. and Hg., he registers there all the three nasal consonants existing in those languages (*m*, *n*, *ŋ*), just as he would do in registering the nasal consonants in English. The phonologist, however, who has considered the diverse functional rôle of the consonants in question in the languages examined, recognizes clearly 1. that all phonic items of a language are not such equipollent units as their simple enumeration made by phonetics would suggest — i.e. in our case, that *ŋ* in Sp., It., Cz. and Hg. is by no means equipollent to *n*, as it is in English, or, e.g., as *m* is to *n* both in English and in these languages —, and 2. that the phonic items of a language are grouped together according to their functions into units which are not identical with, or better, run across, the phonetic categories. Thus, the sounds *n* and *ŋ* must be grouped together as forming a single functional unit (or, as functionally complementing each other) in Sp., It., Cz. and Hg., but they are functionally independent in English. For a phonetician, the dental and the velar sounds are two distinct categories; the phonologist, however, when grouping nasal consonants in Sp., It., Cz. and Hg. on functional lines, may ignore the bar between them, because it is functionally insignificant — he groups thus both the dental and the velar nasal consonant into the same functional unit, into the same phoneme.<sup>1</sup>

Examples of phonetically distinct sounds which, nevertheless, constitute one single phoneme, could easily be multiplied (thus, in English, the initial consonants in *keep*, *call*, *cool* belong, as Prof. D. Jones has rightly emphasized, to the same phoneme, even if they are three distinct sounds; in French, as I have shown in my paper on English diphthongs, the vowel *u* and the semivowel *w* must be phonologically grouped together — and the same applies to French *y* and *ɥ* — in spite of the syllabic character of the first and the non-syllabic character of the second sound), but further illustrations of this kind would be superfluous. What, however, must be emphasized, is that all the sounds of a language may be — after their examination on functional

<sup>1</sup> In other categories of sounds than nasal consonants, of course, the bar between the velar and the dental consonants must not be ignored by a phonologist in those languages, because it has its importance in a functional respect, too: thus *t* and *k* represent separate functional units in Sp., It., Cz. and Hg., *d* and *g* in Sp., It. and Hg.

lines has been done, of which a specimen was given above — grouped into units of the kind described here, into phonemes.

In other words, the immense, practically unlimited number of sounds and sound-variations in every language appears to be a manifestation (or, perhaps, realization) of a definite and strictly limited number of phonemes. As, however, every word of a language appears to be composed wholly of phonemes (as was justly emphasized by Prof. L. Bloomfield in *Language II*, 1926, p. 157), i.e. as all words of a language represent only realized possibilities of combinations of phonemes which are at the disposal of the language in question, it may be seen clearly that instead of explaining the phoneme by a simple equation "a phoneme = a group of sounds functionally complementing each other", we may define it more precisely as a functionally utilizable counter in the language which becomes manifested through a group of sounds constituting a functional unit. The sounds within such a unit, as we have seen, complement each other functionally, i.e. they are mutually exclusive as to their phonic environments (thus, if *a*, *b* and *c* are members of the same functional unit [= if they manifest the same phoneme], *a* never occurs in the same phonic conditions as *b* and *c*, *b* in the same as *a* and *c*, etc.). It need not be emphasized that all sounds belonging to the same functional unit must be closely related in their acoustic and organogenetic character (as are e.g. *n* and *ŋ*, *u* and *w*, *y* and *ɥ*); were it not so, the very unit y of the functional group would be threatened.

One of the sounds grouped together in a functional unit is usually called the fundamental variant of the phoneme, whereas the other sounds are regarded as its combinatory variants. The fundamental variant of a phoneme is that sound of the group whose dependence upon the neighbouring phonemes in the context is least; the combinatory variants, on the contrary, appear to be limited to (or, less precisely, conditioned by) a special phonic environment. Thus, in English, the *k*-sound of *call* is the fundamental variant of the *k*-phoneme, whereas the palatalized *k'* of *keep* and the back labialized *ku* of *cool* represent its combinatory variants, their occurrence being due to the following vowel-sounds exclusively. Similarly, *n* is the fundamental variant of the *n/ŋ*-phoneme in Sp., It., Cz. and Hg., whereas *ŋ* must be regarded as the combinatory variant of the same phoneme in the languages mentioned.

The task of the phonologist, however, is not nearly accomplished by finding out all the phonemes existing in the language examined, i.e. by dividing the whole abundance of sounds (and sound-variations) occurring in that language into thirty or forty functionally autonomous groups of sounds through which phonemes become manifested in actual speech (in *parole*, as it was called by F. de Saussure). The result of a work like that would be only the establishing of the phonological repertory (or, better, inventory) of the given language. Some scholars, indeed, do not proceed further, but the phonologists of the school of Prague and many others urge the necessity of ascertaining the phonological system of the language examined, i.e. of establishing the mutual relations of its phonemes. The old truth is emphasized by them that a part can never be understood if the whole of which it is a part is not continually taken into consideration. An example will explain what is meant by this. Prof. N. S. Trubetzkoy (of Vienna) has shown by the comparison of the German phoneme *k* with an analogical *k*-phoneme existing in Kyakhish-Circassian, one of the languages of the Caucasus, how different these two phonemes (the phonetic realizations of which must be regarded as identical)

appear, if they are considered as forming part of the larger wholes, i.e. of the phonological systems of their languages.

The German phoneme *k*, as is well known, is opposed on one hand to what may be called its voiced counterpart, the *g*-phoneme, on the other hand to the other (quasi-)voiceless consonant phonemes of which German disposes, esp. to the stops *p* and *t*. The Caucasian phoneme may also be considered as a counterpart of the Caucasian phonemes *p*, *t* etc., and *g*, but, in addition to this, as a counterpart of the more velar *q*, of the labialized *k*<sup>o</sup>, of *k*<sup>c</sup> (*k* with glottal stop), and of the geminated *k*, all of which constitute separate phonemes in Kyakhish-Circassian. Thus it may be seen that the position of the *k*-phoneme in the phonological system of German is very different from that of the *k*-phoneme in the phonological system of the Caucasian language in question. The relations of the *k*-phoneme to other phonemes in Ky.-Circ. appear thus to be more complicated and its position in the Ky.-Circassian phonological system more strictly delimited than are the analogical relations and the position of the *k*-phoneme in German.

Besides, even if we keep within the limits of one single language, we cannot fail to notice that its phonemes really do not constitute a mere phonological inventory, but a phonological system. Everyone may recognize quite clearly the variegated and yet systematic nature of the mutual relations of phonemes in any language. Thus, the mutual relation of the English phonemes *p* . *b* and those of *t* : *d*, *k* : *g*, *s* : *z*, *č* : *dž* etc. are undoubtedly regarded as identical by every speaker of English. The relation, however, of — say — *p* and *s* is considered to be of quite another kind; it must, at the same time, be acknowledged by everyone as much looser (i.e., much more distant) than that of *p* : *b*. Much looser still, of course, is the mutual relation of *p* and *r*, or even that of *p* and *æ*.

To avail ourselves of the phonological terminology, we may say that there are two principal kinds of mutual phonematic relations: the correlative relations and the disjunctive. By the term of *correlative* opposition the phonologist understands the opposition of the same kind between two members of several pairs of phonemes, the difference consisting in the presence of a certain phonic item ("the correlation mark") in one of the members, and in its absence in the other member of each pair. Thus, in English, the opposition of phonemes within the pairs *p* : *b*, *t* : *d*, *k* : *g*, *s* : *z*, *š* : *ž*, *č* : *dž* etc. is of a correlative nature, the voiced character (the sonority), absent in *p*, *t*, *k*, *s*, *š*, *č*... and present in *b*, *d*, *g*, *z*, *ž*, *dž*..., being the correlation mark in this case. — Similarly, in German the opposition of phonemes within the pairs *a*-*ā*, *e*-*ē*, *i*-*ī*, *o*-*ō*, *u*-*ū* etc. is also of a correlative nature, the quantity being the mark of correlation here.

Phonemes the relation of which is correlative are called correlative phonemes. Those members of the pairs of correlation which are characterized by the absence of the correlation mark, are called *unmarked correlative phonemes* (French: non marqués, German: merkmалlos), those for which the presence of the mark of correlation is characteristic, the *marked* ones (Fr.: marqués, Germ.: merkmалhaltig). (Examples of unmarked correlative phonemes: *p*, *t*, *k*..., *a*, *e*, *i*...; of the corresponding marked ones: *b*, *d*, *g*..., *ā*, *ē*, *ī*...). If we try to abstract from both the presence and the absence of the mark of correlation in the two phonemes united by a correlative relation, we arrive at a substratum which is called an *archiphoneme* in phonological theory. (Examples of archiphonemes: *a* without any respect to whether its quantity is long or short; a labial stop consonant, be it voiced or voiceless.)



By the term *disjunctive relation* of the phonemes is designated the non-correlative relation, i.e. such an opposition of two phonemes as cannot be schematized by the formula  $(a + 0) : (a + m)$ ,  $a$  indicating the archiphoneme,  $m$  the correlation mark (met with also in other pairs of phonemes in this same function). Phonemes the relation of which is disjunctive are called disjunctive phonemes. (Examples of disjunctive relations of phonemes: Engl.  $p : s$ ,  $p : r$ ,  $p : \text{æ}$ . — It need hardly be emphasized that these pairs of phonemes represent various degrees of disjunction, the relation of the phonemes  $p : s$ , as we have already said, being much closer than that of the phonemes  $p : r$ , or even  $p : \text{æ}$ . To put it differently, if a correlative relation is characterized by the degree zero of disjunction, the number of degrees rises continually in the three pairs pointed out here, the highest degree of disjunction being reached by the pair  $p : \text{æ}$ .)

It is hardly necessary to state that examples of various marks of correlation, and, in consequence, of various possible kinds of correlative relations, could easily be multiplied (thus e.g. both the stress and pitch attributes of vowels, the nasal resonance of vowels, special kinds of timbre both in vowels and in consonants may, in various languages, occur in the function of the mark of correlation), but this would be altogether beyond the scope of an informative paper in which only the fundamental theses of phonological theory can be dealt with. Even here, however, it must not be left unnoticed that Russian linguists (R. Jakobson and N. S. Trubetzkoy) have succeeded in establishing interesting connections between various correlative relations. Thus, e.g., the presence of the quantitative correlation in vowels excludes the presence of the correlation of stress in the same linguistic system; the absence of the quantitative correlation consistently implies also the absence of pitch correlations in the same linguistic system, etc. etc.<sup>1</sup>

By establishing the phonemes existing in the given language as well as the kinds of their mutual relations, the phonological system of the language in question may be said to have been satisfactorily described. Its characterization, however, is not complete, unless these qualitative data are supplemented by data referring to the quantitative aspect of the phonological structure of the language examined. We shall show briefly what facts are included in this quantitative aspect.

We have seen in the previous pages that differences of phonemes may be closely associated with differences of meaning, i.e. that phonemes are capable of distinguishing words, still better, that they are employed by the language as autonomous functional factors. It is quite obvious, however, that the difference between the members of one pair of phonemes is responsible for a much greater number of differences of meaning than are the differences between the members of other pairs of phonemes. In other words, the number of the pairs of words (of different meaning) which all are distinguished formally by the difference between two phonemes only is not the same for all pairs of phonemes; on the contrary, it is very high for some of the pairs and very slight for others. Thus, there is certainly a considerable number of pairs of words of different meaning in English the phonematic structure of which is identical except for the difference between the phonemes  $p$  and  $b$

<sup>1</sup> Dutch readers may here be referred to an article by Prof. A. W. de Groot: *De Wetten der Phonologie en hun betekenis voor de studie van het Nederlands* (*N. Taalqids*, XXV, 1931, pp. 225—243). — Ed.

(e.g. *pad-bad*, *pet-bet*, *pit-bit*, *push-bush*, *rip-rib*, *cap-cab*, *repel-rebel*), but a very small number of words of the same type which differ formally in *p*—*ð* only (*thigh-thy*, *sooth-soothe*). It is quite evident that use is made of the difference between *p* and *b* much more frequently in English for functional purposes than of the difference between *p* and *ð*. The phonologist says that the *functional burdening* (French: *rendement fonctionnel*, German: *funktionelle Belastung*) of the phonological correlative opposition of *p* and *b* is much greater than that of the phonological correlative opposition of *p* and *ð*.

Thus we have given here one little instance from which it may be seen how quantitative data make the phonological characterization of the language examined more distinct and precise than it would be without them. To characterize a language in the most precise way possible, a phonologist may, as was shown by Prof. V. Mathesius, examine the quantitative aspect of the phonological structure of the language in many more respects. To mention some examples out of many possible ones, he may study the combinations of phonemes occurring in the language examined (consonant groups and vowel groups as well as the way in which consonants are combined with vowels) and compare the number of combinations realized in the language examined with the number of combinations theoretically possible, i.e. he may ask how many per cent of these a priori computable possibilities are realized by the language in question. Moreover, the relation of the groups established to the various places of the word and to the limits of morphemes may be ascertained — in some languages it is the beginning, in some the end, in others again the middle of the word which favours or avoids them especially; very often the limits of morphemes exhibit phonematic groups which otherwise do not occur in the language, etc. etc.

Similar deviations in phonological structure may be perceived in words that are synchronically felt as foreign elements in the language; the same applies to onomatopoetic words and to words of emotional character. Such categories of words display very often phonemes or phonematic combinations otherwise unknown to the language, or phonemes that do otherwise occur in the language, but usually in other phonic environments. Thus, e.g., nasal vowels appear only in foreign words in English, as in *restaurant*; in the English interjection *psaw*, again, the combination of phonemes *pš-* is found initially, which otherwise is unknown to English phonological habits, etc. etc.

It is a well-known fact that words do not represent the smallest elements of speech in which a certain meaning is inherent, and that it is the morphemes which do so. As I have shown in another paper, a continual regard to the limits of morphemes is indispensable to phonological analysis. It has been just mentioned that in many languages limits of morphemes are characterized by groups of phonemes which otherwise are unknown to the language. For these and other reasons, the phonologist examines the morphemes of various languages as to their phonological structure. He finds that languages differ very widely in this respect, not only as regards the phonological extent of morphemes and the variability of phonological repertory in diverse places of morphemes (in some languages, e.g., no vowel phonemes are allowed to stand at the beginning of morphemes), but also as regards the phonological uniformity of one and the same morpheme. That is to say, in many languages the same morpheme may appear in two (or more) different phonological realizations, thus in English pres. ind. *křip* : past t. *křep/t*, sg. *louf* : pl. *louf/z* — but e.g. *pās* : *pās/t*, *houp* : *houp/s*. In the two latter cases, the phonological

realization of the morphemes *pās-*, *houp-* remains the same in both forms; in the two former cases, however, the same morphemes have two phonological realizations each — *krip-/k'ep-*, *louf-/louv-*. The alternating pairs (sometimes groups) of phonemes like *i/e*, *f/v* evidently form special units which, being conditioned by morphematic circumstances, are called *morphonemes*<sup>1</sup>. Naturally, the study of morphonemes existing in a given language must also be undertaken, if the phonological characterization is to be accurate. That part of phonology which examines the phonological structure of morphemes, is called *morphonology*.

All that has been dealt with up to now in the present paper refers to so-called *word-phonology*, i.e. to that part of phonology which deals with phonic differences capable of distinguishing isolated words in the given language. Another department of phonology has to be mentioned here, viz. *syntactical phonology*, which deals with phonic differences capable of the delimitation of words within the sentence (this is the rôle of stress e.g. in French) or of distinguishing meanings of whole phrases in the language in question (as an example, interrogative and affirmative intonations in many languages may be mentioned). Examinations of diverse languages, dealing with their syntactical phonology, have, however, not advanced so far as yet as those dealing with their word-phonology; it is for this reason that we shall not enter here into the details of syntactical phonology.

Again: what has been said about phonology up to this moment in the present paper, may easily give rise to the impression that phonology is a strictly synchronistic, non-historical branch of linguistics, i.e. that only the phonic aspect of a language in a certain period of time may be subjected to phonological examination. Such an impression, however, would be erroneous. We have already seen that phonemes in a language do not constitute a mere phonological inventory, but a phonological system. Like every system, also the phonological system is characterized by a certain balance of its component parts, none of which, as we have shown in this paper, can be understood unless it is regarded as a part of the whole system. Thus each of the parts of the system is literally propped and upheld by other parts, and it is in this mutual support that the balance of the system consists.

If, however, this is true of the present stage of the language, the same must have been true of the previous stages through which it has passed in its development. Both the present and the past stages of the same language must be regarded as balanced systems of a quite analogical kind. One thing, however, seems to contradict this — the sound-changes that take place in all languages. If any stage of any language — it may be argued — represents a well-balanced system, why do any changes take place at all? And, if they take place, is not the balance of the system menaced by them?

The phonologist, nevertheless, insists upon the balanced state of any stage of language-development, and at the same time holds sound-changes to be not only harmless, but even necessary factors, as far as their relation to the synchronically balanced phonological systems is concerned. The system in question, namely, is never absolutely balanced; always there may be seen an insufficiency in some of its points. To do away with the insufficiency,

---

<sup>1</sup> A morphoneme is usually defined as a complex idea of alternating phonemes; by defining it, however, as a repertory of alternating phonemes, we avoid the risk of leaving the ground of linguistics.



a change is called forth by the system. Such a change executes its task successfully, i.e. it improves the balance of the system in the point where it was menaced, but, on the other hand, menaces itself the balance of the system in another of its points, so that again a new change is required to restore its balance etc. etc. — The phonologist urges that it is this very principle of therapeutic changes (together with some others of less importance) which may answer in a definite way the old question of why sound-changes take place at all. The *phonological history* of Russian, as it has been established by R. Jakobson, may serve as a model for future attempts at phonological histories of other languages.

Not only historical grammar, but also *linguistic geography* may profit by the new phonological methods. It has been shown, namely, that groups of neighbouring languages often exhibit identical phonological features, even if they belong, genetically, to different families of languages. We may refer to Prof. B. Havránek's remarks on the languages of the Balkan peninsula and to R. Jakobson's observations bearing on the languages of Eurasia.

If we now ask how the programme of phonological research which we have sketched has been accomplished for the *English language*, the answer must be that very little has been done as yet in this field. We know, in rough outlines, the phonological inventory of English, thanks to the investigations of Prof. D. Jones and his school. The present writer has tried to throw some light upon some points of the English phonological system, especially upon the mutual relations of vowel phonemes in English. To Prof. V. Mathesius the phonology of English owes some important data referring to the functional burdening of phonemes and combinations of phonemes in English. The observations of Prof. B. Trnka, again, may serve as valuable suggestions for the future investigation of English morphonology which, of course, remains to be written. The same applies to the phonological history of English, the foundations of which, though unconsciously, were laid by Prof. K. Luick as early as the end of the 19th century. Researches in phonological geography, too, have not yet proceeded so far as to allot to the English language its definite place in the phonological zones of the world. Here, again, interesting observations of Prof. V. Mathesius may serve as a starting-point. As he has rightly emphasized, English, in spite of its Germanic origin, displays in many respects phonological features analogical to those of French, which, in its turn, is different, in this point, from other Romanic languages.

To turn to the *history of the phonological point-of-view*, the names of two scholars must be mentioned who arrived, independently, at the notion of phoneme many years ago, namely those of the famous Polish philologist *Jean Baudouin de Courtenay*, whose influence has been very strong in Russia, and of *Ferdinand de Saussure*, the founder of the Geneva linguistic school. To the former, however, the phoneme is not a functional factor, but a "psychical image of the sound" (*Lautvorstellung*). In other respects, too, the psychological attitude of the Polish scholar may be said to have prevented him from deducing all conclusions from the difference between the sound and the phoneme that he established. F. de Saussure, again, who was the first to emphasize that „ce qui... caractérise (les phonèmes), ce n'est pas, comme on pourrait le croire, leur qualité propre et positive, mais simplement le fait qu'ils ne se confondent pas entre eux", and that phonemes are „avant tout des entités oppositives, relatives et négatives" (*Cours* 164), has never strictly delimited phonology from phonetics (to him, the term phonology

itself meant what we call phonetics, the term phonetics being used by him in the sense of „historische Lautlehre”), not to speak of the fact that he restricted the applicability of functionalistic methods to the synchronistic study of language only.

It may be noted as a thing of particular interest, that it was two eminent linguists who have devoted much work to the study of English — a language the phenomena of which have more than once defied explanation by the old Junggrammatiker methods — who became, in various respects, of course, precursors of phonology. The first of them, Prof. O. Jespersen, has carefully distinguished, in his *Lehrbuch der Phonetik*, between functionally relevant and functionally irrelevant phonic facts. Thus he (p. 182) draws a distinction between what he calls „innerlich bestimmte Quantität”, i.e. „Quantität (, die) ein ebenso wichtiger Bestandteil der Worte ist und ebenso gut zur Unterscheidung der Bedeutung gebraucht werden kann wie die Lautbestandteile an und für sich”, and that kind of quantity which is, according to his term, „äusserlich bestimmt”, i.e. which depends upon the stress, upon the phonic environment etc. exclusively. Similar remarks of Prof. Jespersen refer to stress (p. 212.) In the last chapter of his *Lehrbuch*, he emphasized what he calls „die lautliche Oekonomie der Sprache”, viz. the fact that phonic differences negligible in some languages on account of their functional irrelevance, must be very carefully noted in other languages, because they are functionally relevant in them. That is why e.g. a Frenchman will hardly notice the difference in pairs of German words like *aus-Haus*, *Erz-Herz*, *Eis-heiss* — he does not know any functionally relevant *h-* from his mother-tongue.

The other is Prof. K. Luick whose „Verdrängungstheorie”, in principle dating from as early as 1896, must be considered, as I have shown in detail in another paper, as an anticipation of researches in historical phonology, even if the theoretical views of Prof. Luick cannot be identified with those of historical phonologists of to-day.

A functionalistic and systematizing conception of phonic phenomena of speech appears very clearly in some writings of Prof. E. Sapir (Yale) whose „sound-patterns” may be identified with what has been called by the term „phonological system” in this paper. Every phoneme (or, as Prof. Sapir says, every point of the pattern) is felt as „placed” in its relation to the other sounds of the system, on account both of its phonic qualities and its morphological functions.

The position of Prof. D. Jones (and of his pupils) is an exceptional one among the precursors of modern phonology. To him, a phoneme (which he mentions first in his *Pronunciation of Russian*, published in 1923) is not a functional, but merely a phonetic unit; it is a family of sounds which are all related in character and mutually exclusive as to the sounds surrounding them. The distinctive function of phonemes and the absence of such a function in variants of the same phoneme is, according to Prof. Jones, merely a consequence of the principle of mutual exclusion just referred to. In short, the phoneme of Prof. Jones is a unit the establishing of which was due to purposes of phonetic transcription, not to the study of language as a functioning system. (For particulars, see my paper on „Prof. Jones and the phoneme” mentioned below.)

We shall not enumerate here other precursors of phonological research. It is the phonologists in the full sense of the word with whom we shall close our historical perspective. At the First International Congress of Linguists

which took place at The Hague in 1928, three young Russian linguists, *R. Jakobson*, *S. Karcevskij* and *N. S. Trubetzkoy* laid their theses relating to phonology before its members. Combined with the theses of Proff. Bally and Sechehaye, developing the ideas of the Geneva linguistic school, and with those of Prof. V. Mathesius on linguistic characterology, they constitute a programme of modern linguistic research-work based on the functional conception of language, and emphasizing the synchronic point-of-view in linguistic analysis, and were, in this form, approved of by the Congress. The theses of the Russians, concise and condensed as they were, contained *in nuce* all the postulates concerning the phonological research of languages, as they have been dealt with in the present paper. Deeply influenced by the famous Baudouinian traditions of Russian linguistics, the Russians have succeeded in applying methods of phonological research to synchrony as well as to diachrony, to isolated words as well as to whole sentences.

Whereas the Russians are fond of establishing general phonological principles valid in all languages of the world, and of sketching, in imposing lines, the contours of the phonological systems of all kinds of languages, Prof. V. Mathesius, the founder of the Cercle Linguistique de Prague, who has fought, since as early as 1911, for the acknowledgement of the scientific character of the synchronistic study of languages (splendidly vindicated by the very advent of phonological research), examines more subtle and delicate problems of the phonological systems of living languages, arriving thus at their synchronic characterology. — Among other Czech phonologists, especially Prof. *B. Trnka*, Prof. *B. Havránek* and Prof. *J. Mukařovský* must be named.

The importance of phonological studies was clearly to be seen at the Second International Congress of Linguists held at Geneva in 1931, where phonology constituted one of the chief points discussed in full sittings of the Congress, and at the International Congress of Phonetic Sciences held at Amsterdam last year. As an event of considerable importance, too, the International Phonological Conference in Prague is to be mentioned which took place in December 1930, partly because it was there that a considerable number of distinguished European scholars present at the conference for the first time expressed their warm sympathy toward the activities of phonologists (among them, the names of the Dutch linguists, Proff. *Jac. van Ginneken* and *A. W. de Groot* stand out), partly on account of its resolution to establish an International Phonological Association whose task should be to prepare phonological descriptions of the greatest possible number of living languages of the world. As the first work of this kind, the phonological description of Russian is being planned which is to be published in the autumn of this year (the authors are *R. Jakobson*, *S. Karcevskij* and *N. S. Trubetzkoy*).

### Bibliography.

The section G. excepted, only the most important books and papers have been mentioned. — TCLP = Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague (Praha).

#### A. On phonemes and mutual relations of phonemes.

*N. S. Trubetzkoy*: Zur allgemeinen Theorie der phonologischen Vokalsysteme. TCLP 1, 1929, pp. 39—67.



- N. S. *Trubetzkoy*: Die phonologischen Systeme. TCLP IV, 1931, pp. 96—116.  
 K. *Bühler*: Phonetik und Phonologie. TCLP IV, 1931, pp. 22—53.  
 R. *Jakobson*: Die Betonung und ihre Rolle in der Wort- und Syntagmaphonologie. TCLP IV, 1931, pp. 164—182.  
 A. W. *de Groot*: De wetten der phonologie en hun betekenis voor de studie van het Nederlands. De Nieuwe Taalgids, XXV, 1931, pp. 225-243.
- B. On functional burdening of phonemes.  
 V. *Mathesius*: On the phonological system of Modern English. Donum natalicium Schrijnen (Nijmegen-Utrecht, 1928), pp. 46—53.  
 V. *Mathesius*: Zum Problem der Belastungs- und Kombinationsfähigkeit der Phoneme. TCLP IV, 1931, pp. 148—152.
- C. On morphonology.  
 N. S. *Trubetzkoy*: Gedanken über Morphonologie. TCLP IV, 1931, pp. 160—163.  
 N. *Troubetzkoy*: Sur la morphonologie. TCLP I, 1929, pp. 85 ff.
- D. On syntactical phonology.  
 R. *Jakobson*: Die Betonung und ihre Rolle in der Wort- und Syntagmaphonologie (see section A.)  
 S. *Karcevskij*: Sur la phonologie de la phrase. TCLP IV, 1931, pp. 188—227.
- E. On phonological geography.  
 N. S. *Trubetzkoy*: Phonologie und Sprachgeographie. TCLP IV, 1931, pp. 228—234.  
 R. *Jakobson*: Ueber die phonologischen Sprachbünde. TCLP IV, 1931, pp. 234—240.  
 B. *Havránek*: Zur phonologischen Geographie (Das Vokalsystem des balkanischen Sprachbundes). Proceedings of the International Congress of Phonetic Sciences (Amsterdam 1932), pp. 28—34.
- F. On historical phonology.  
 R. *Jakobson*: Prinzipien der historischen Phonologie. TCLP IV, 1931, pp. 247—267.  
 R. *Jakobson*: Remarques sur l'évolution phonologique du russe comparée à celle des autres langues slaves. (= TCLP II, 1929.)
- G. On the phonology of English.  
 D. *Jones*: An Outline of English Phonetics. 3. Ed. Leipzig 1932.  
 I. C. *Ward*: The Phonetics of English. Cambridge 1929.  
 J. *Vachek*: Ueber die phonologische Interpretation der Diphthonge mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Englischen. In: Facultas philosophica universitatis Carolinae Pragensis, Práce z vědeckých ústavu, vol. XXXIII. (Praha 1933), pp. 87—170.  
 V. *Mathesius*: On the phonological system of Modern English (see section B.).  
 V. *Mathesius*: Zum Problem der Belastungs- und Kombinationsfähigkeit der Phoneme (see section B.).  
 B. *Trnka*: Some thoughts on structural morphology. Charisteria Guilelmo Mathesio quinquagenario... oblata (Pragae 1932), pp. 57—61.  
 B. *Trnka*: Some remarks on the phonological structure of English. Xenia Pragensia Ernesto Kraus septuagenario et Josepho Janko sexagenario... oblata (Pragae 1929), pp. 357—364.  
 K. *Luick*: Untersuchungen zur englischen Lautgeschichte. Strassburg 1896.  
 K. *Luick*: Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache. I. Band, S. 1—796. Leipzig 1913—29.
- H. On the history of the phonological point-of-view.  
 V. *Mathesius*: Ziele und Aufgaben der vergleichenden Phonologie. Xenia Pragensia E. Kraus... et J. Janko... oblata (Pragae 1929), pp. 432—445.  
 V. *Mathesius*: La place de la linguistique fonctionnelle et structurale dans le développement général des études linguistiques. Časopis pro moderní filologii XVIII, 1931-2 (Praha), pp. 1—7.  
 J. *Baudouin de Courtenay*: Versuch einer Theorie phonetischer Alternationen. Strassburg 1895.  
 F. *de Saussure*: Cours de linguistique générale. 3. éd. Paris 1931.  
 O. *Jespersen*: Lehrbuch der Phonetik. 2. Ed. Leipzig-Berlin 1913.

- K. Luick: Untersuchungen zur englischen Lautgeschichte (see section G).  
 J. Vachek: Prof. K. Luick and Problems of Historical Phonology. *Časopis pro moderní filologii* XIX, 1932-3 (Praha), No. 3—4.  
 E. Sapir: Sound Patterns in Language. *Language* I, 1925, pp. 37—51.  
 M. V. Trofimov-D. Jones: The Pronunciation of Russian. Cambridge Univ. Press. 1923.  
 D. Jones: Definition of a phoneme. *Maître Phonétique* 1929, pp. 43—44.  
 D. Jones: The theory of Phonemes and its importance in practical linguistics. Proceedings of the International Congress of Phonetic Sciences (Amsterdam 1932), pp. 23—24.  
 J. Vachek: Prof. Daniel Jones and the phoneme. *Charisteria Gu. Mathesio quinquagenario... oblata* (Pragae 1932), pp. 25—33.

The original theses of R. Jakobson, S. Karcevskij and N. S. Trubetzkoy may be found in *Actes du Premier congrès international de linguistes à La Haye (Leiden)*, pp. 33—36, the definitive formulation, including the theses of Proff. Bally and Sechehaye and of Prof. V. Mathesius, *ibid.* pp. 85—86. A detailed account of the International Phonological Conference held in Prague (1930) is given in the IVth vol. of *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague*, in which also the *Projet de la terminologie phonologique standardisée* and the *Principes de transcription phonologique* may be found, both papers being results of the collective work of the members of the Cercle Linguistique de Prague. An ample bibliography of books and papers published from January 1931 to June 1932 may be found in No. 1 of the *Bulletin d'information of the International Phonological Association* (obtainable from the Cercle Linguistique de Prague, Praha I, Smetanovo nám. 55); No 2 of the same Bulletin is in preparation.

Prague.

JOSEF VACHEK.

## Notes and News.

**The Malvern Festival.** Those who attended the 1931 Festival at Malvern will remember the enthusiastic reception accorded to Sheridan's *Trip to Scarborough*, a reception which induced Sir Barry Jackson, the genial and popular director of this annual dramatic feast, to transfer the play afterwards to the West End... where it was withdrawn after a few nights. This may seem strange and contradictory, but on second thoughts it is not to be wondered at, for the drama, more than any other art, depends for its effect upon the interplay of emotions between audience and players. Now, no one will deny that the character of a London audience differs materially from the one at Malvern. The metropolitan public is of necessity a curious medley: besides the genuine theatre-lover, it contains the sophisticated, the high-brow, the blasé, as well as the man who is merely out for an evening's enjoyment, a reprieve from the day's care and worry. And although this does not of course imply that London invariably responds differently from Malvern (the "many-headed monster" always remains a mysteriously capricious creature), yet the whole setting, the atmosphere of this lovely Worcestershire resort and the character of its patrons are undoubtedly more conducive to the success of plays for the appreciation of which another mentality is needed than that of the average playgoer.

I am sure it is this very particular atmosphere which constitutes the charm and the importance of the Malvern festival. Here no sign that box-office interests are paramount, but an evident desire to serve the purposes of art first and foremost. And as to the public — with a variant on Bassanio's words we may say even more appropriately that "the four winds blow in

from every coast" fervent devotees of dramatic art, people who in many cases have come a very long way, not to be "amused" or "entertained" only (though the theatrical fare offered is anything but forbidding), but to undergo the exceptional delight afforded by the production of rare bits of English dramatic literature, seldom or never seen on the regular stage, which often turn out to be extremely enjoyable and are always highly interesting as exponents of life and manners of bygone times.

This fact, that visitors are almost without exception actuated by the same worthy purpose, creates that rare unity of atmosphere which is most favourable for bringing out the particular qualities of the kind of plays in which Malvern has specialized in the last few years. And their enjoyment is heightened still by the circumstance that we are far from the disturbing influences of the "madding crowd", in one of the finest parts of England, rich in beautiful scenery and historical associations.

The name of ubiquitous "Sir Barry" is a guarantee that acting and production are always of exceptionally high quality; the playhouse is commodious and remarkably well appointed, while the comparatively limited space in which artists and visitors regularly meet, brings about a kind of intimacy, a certain invisible bond which is not the least appreciable charm of this festival.

I enjoyed every minute of my stay in 1931, and I have no doubt that a visit to Malvern is the ideal holiday for the man desirous to taste the delights of the English countryside together with those of English dramatic literature served in the most palatable form.

Alkmaar.

J. B. VAN AMERONGEN.

**Summer Meetings and Festivals.** We draw our readers' attention to two of the best ways of spending their holidays in England, viz. the Malvern Festival, and the Oxford Summer Meeting. Dr. J. B. van Amerongen on this page writes a word of recommendation of the former; we may add that the text of the plays to be produced is obtainable in book form (Heath Cranton, 5 s. net.)

The Oxford Delegacy that organizes the Summer Meeting publishes a useful Guide to Preparatory Reading (price 3d.) which intending students will do well to procure beforehand. Further particulars may be obtained from Rev. F. E. Hutchinson, Rewley House, Wellington Square, Oxford.

**B-Examen 1932.** De *Ned. Staatscourant* van 3 Mei 1933, no. 86, bevat het verslag der commissie in 1932 belast geweest met het afnemen van de examens in de Engelse taal en letterkunde, middelbaar onderwijs B, waaruit wij het volgende overnemen:

„Het is de commissie gebleken, dat sommige kandidaten, ook al ontbrak het hun niet geheel aan kennis van de syntaxis van het Oud- en Middel-Engelsch, geen acht hadden geslagen op belangrijke syntactische eigenaardigheden in schrijvers uit de 16de, 17de en 18de eeuw. Zij raadt toekomstigen kandidaten aan bij hun lectuur van deze schrijvers zich nu en dan van deze



dingen rekenschap te geven, wat degenen, die behoorlijk van de syntaxis van het hedendaagsch Engelsch op de hoogte zijn, geen bijzondere moeite behoeft te kosten.

Wat het examen in de letterkunde betreft, merkt de commissie op, dat zij geen prijs stelt op zeer uitgebreide leeslijsten. Zij dringt er echter zeer op aan, dat de kandidaten zorgvuldig overwegen welke werken van door hen bestudeerde schrijvers ze zullen lezen. Niet zelden bleken van groote schrijvers belangrijke werken geheel verwaarloosd te zijn, terwijl werk van ondergeschikte beteekenis wèl als „bestudeerd” op de lijst voorkwam. Het viel de commissie op, dat Shakespeare's historische stukken wat al te veel verwaarloosd werden. De commissie herhaalt, wat reeds in het verslag van 1930 is opgemerkt, dat de kandidaten zich door herhaalde lezing vertrouwd moeten maken met de door hen bestudeerde werken.

Bij het letterkundig opstel was de commissie weer eenige malen genoodzaakt een onvoldoend praedicaat toe te kennen, omdat de kandidaten zich niet voldoende rekenschap hadden gegeven van het opgegeven onderwerp.”

---

## Reviews.

*Beowulfstudien*, von JOHANNES HOOPS. *Anglistische Forschungen*, Heft 74. Pp. viii + 140. Heidelberg, 1932. RM. 7.50.

The volume under review is divided into two parts: *Abhandlungen* (pp. 1-88) and *Kritischer Einzelkommentar* (pp. 89-140). Except for the first *Abhandlung*, however, which lays down the principles of textual criticism upon which the rest of the book is built up, the distinction between the two parts is of little moment; we have in both a series of commentaries upon various passages in the English poem which have aroused the scientific interest of the author. The whole is an admirable example of philological scholarship, the fruit of many years of intimate association with the poem to the elucidation of which it is devoted.

The first *Abhandlung* gives us a vigorous defense of the conservatism which now at long last is becoming fashionable in the matter of emendation of the inherited text. I will comment on a few details. H. says (p. 5) that the spelling *eo* for *ea* occurs six times in the text; he does not include *beorn* 1880 and *heoldon* 3084. The latter form can hardly be anything but an infinitive, while *beorn* is obviously pret. sg. of *beornan* (birnan); the usual emendation to *born* is as needless as Grein's emendation to *bearn*, adopted by Wyatt and Chambers (cf. *Christ* 540). The insertion of *swa* in 1404b (p. 10; cf. p. 108) is more for metrical than for syntactical reasons. Since H. agrees with me (p. 12) in retaining the MS reading of 1379, one may infer that he agrees with me likewise in opposing emendation of 2220 (*JEGPh* XXVII, 318 ff.), but he does not say so. In the discussion of consonants (p. 7) I miss a reference to cases like *selerædenne* 51 (*Anglia* LIII 335 f.); one would like to know how H. stands here. To the examples of the phonetic change *pl* > *dl* should be added *Hrædles* 1485, *Hrædlan* 454, and these forms should also be listed among the examples given (pp. 5f) of the spelling *æ* for Anglian *œ* (but see Björkman, *Eigennamen*, p. 69, note 4).

In the second *Abhandlung*, H. solves the old problem of *lange ahte* 31; he explains *lange* as acc. pl. of an adj. *lang* 'related, verwandt,' here used in the sense 'relations, kinsmen, retainers.' The third, fourth, fifth and sixth *Abhandlungen* may be described as critical reviews of recent papers by Ericson (*Eng. Studien* LXV 343 ff.), Krogmann (*Anglia* LVI 40 ff.), Bryan (*MPh* XXVIII 157 ff.) and Weber (*Neuphil. Monatsschrift* II 293 ff.) respectively. The seventh *Abhandlung* discusses *Beowulf* 303 ff. H. defends the emendation *hleorbergan* 304, but without success, in my opinion. The eighth *Abhandlung* deals with *Beowulf* 489 f., and after an exceedingly valuable survey of previous work gives us a plausible explanation of *meoto*, which H. takes to be the acc. pl. of a fem. abstract noun *metu*, *meotu* 'thought' (connected with OE *metigan* 'consider'). The ninth *Abhandlung* is devoted to *ealuserwen* 769; I need say no more! In the tenth *Abhandlung*, H. considers *Beowulf* 867 ff.; he puts a full stop after *gebunden* 871, and takes *word oþer fand* 870 as the predicate of *þegn* 867. The eleventh *Abhandlung* is reprinted from the Panzer Festschrift *Deutschkundliches*, pp. 34 ff. The twelfth *Abhandlung*, on the Finnsburg Episode, and the thirteenth, on the Offa Episode, are by all odds the most important sections in the book. I will not try to sketch their contents, but no student of *Beowulf* can afford to leave them unread. The fourteenth *Abhandlung*, which deals with the Ingeld Episode, has little to offer, apart from an eminently sensible note on *Freaware* 2022 and a valuable discussion of *beah* 2041. The fifteenth *Abhandlung* plausibly explains *cræfte* 2181 as an acc. sg. fem. form. The sixteenth and last *Abhandlung*, devoted to *Scildingas* 3005, is a revised version of a paper first published in the Max Förster Festschrift *Britannica*, pp. 26 ff.; H. emends to *scildwigan*. His arguments for this emendation are not convincing, to me at any rate.

In the *Kommentar* a great number of small points are taken up and discussed with the author's characteristic clarity and acumen. I will confine my discussion to a few interpretations with which I am not in agreement or to which I have something to add. According to H. (p. 105), the *sið* of line 908 refers to the expedition which the Lotherus of Saxo undertook against his brother Humblus. Obviously H. follows Sievers in identifying Heremod with Lotherus. It is really extraordinary that this philological legend (to use Tupper's apt term) has had so long a life and still turns up in the writings of otherwise conservative scholars. That Heremod appears in Saxo under the name Lotherus is a theory for which indeed *die sichern Unterlagen fehlen*, as H. said in another connexion (p. 88) but unluckily does not say here. The names *Lotherus* and *Humblus* answer to the *Hlōðr* and *Humli* of the Icelandic *Hervararsaga*, and Saxo's Lotherus is grandson of a Humblus precisely as Hlōðr is grandson of Humli. The brother of Lotherus, the Humblus II of Saxo, has no obvious counterpart anywhere, and least of all in *Beowulf*, where there is not the slightest hint that Heremod had a brother. Elsewhere (*PMLA* XL 804 ff.) I have tried to work out the literary connexions of the Saxonian episode, but whether my reconstruction be right or wrong, conservative scholarship must give up the ingenious but demonstrably unsound identification which in a moment of weakness Sievers laid before an all too uncritical learned public.

*Ofereode* 1408 is probably not a sg. (p. 108) but a plural form, with phonetic loss of *-n* before the initial consonant of the following word, and phonetic reduction of the vowel of the final syllable; see *Curme Volume* p. 116. — Besides *eðelwyn* 2493 (p. 111) might have been mentioned *hordwynne*

2270, a word which seems to mean 'hoard-house, treasury.' — The author's convincing connexion of *sioleða* 2367 with Swedish dialectal *sil* and its congeners (p. 123) was first suggested by Bugge (*ZfdPh* IV 214). — In his discussion of 2545 ff. (p. 126), H. does not mention Henel's paper (*Anglia* LV 273 ff.). — I should prefer (p. 128 f.) to translate 2573-5 as follows: 'now that he had to conquer in the first fight in which fate was not on his side' (literally: 'when he on this occasion had to rule the first day in which fate had not decreed for him glory in battle'). — The *wundum* heard of line 2687 (p. 130) is a variation of *he* 2686 and refers to Beowulf, who is represented as 'hard by virtue of wounds (received in battle),' i.e. as a veteran; emendation to *wundrum* is therefore needless. — If *ellen* 2706 is to be emended (pp. 130 f.), a less violent emendation than the *ellor* which H. favors would be *ellne* (dat. sg.); the half-line would then mean: 'life and strength departed.' But *ellen* is best taken as parenthetical, a variation of *ferh*.

Baltimore, U.S.A.

KEMP MALONE.

*Der Germanische Volksglaube von den Toten und Dämonen im Berg und ihrer Beschwichtigung. Die Spuren in England.* Von W. JORDANS. Bonn, P. Hanstein. 1933. (Bonner Studien zur engl. Philologie, 17). 71 pp. Pr. Mk. 3.60.

In two respects Dr. Jordans' little book may be considered as a contribution of some consequence towards our knowledge of the history of primitive beliefs in the old Germanic world. From English popular and learned tradition the writer quotes a number of passages illustrative of the belief in the demonic power of the dead that might otherwise have escaped our attention. They do not contain anything particularly remarkable. Also, it is shown how in England the reception of Christianity entailed the transferring of the rôle of the pagan demon-fighter to christian saints, although gradually the practice of sorcery returned, and now in a very primitive form. Thus the evolution in England confirms what we already know from the Scandinavian countries, especially Iceland. Apart from this, the treatment of the subject can hardly be called satisfactory. The old Germanic world is represented as an absolute unity as regards its religious beliefs and practices, notwithstanding the differences in the social and cultural conditions that prevailed in different parts. Valhöll, for instance, is called a „mythologisches Totenreich der Germanen" (p. 12). This implies a good deal more than we really know about it: a very exclusive group of one particular Teutonic people believed in it at a fixed period of its history. Likewise, it is taken for granted that Finnish magical practices may serve as instances of early proto-Germanic rites (p. 16). Even if "proto-Germanic" be replaced by "Norse", the thesis remains open to doubts. Cultural borrowings from their Scandinavian neighbours must have received a more primitive character at the hands of the Finns. Icelandic sagas are freely instanced in order to illustrate the original Germanic notions on demons and demon-fighters. Although this method cannot be disqualified altogether, it must always be borne in mind that Icelandic society shows some very peculiar traits, which are explained



from its colonial character. Of course, the Saxon invaders of Britain constituted a colony, too, but not, as was the case with their Icelandic kinsmen, in an uninhabited land.

As a typical hero who is also a demon-fighter Dr. Jordans, of course, points to Grettir Asmundarson. As is generally admitted, one of Grettir's exploits presents a close parallel to Beowulf's fight with Grendel. But Grettir was an outlaw and according to Icelandic belief the outlaw partakes of the life of the demons and spirits, so that he acquires a certain amount of supernatural power himself. Grettir is not simply a hero but a demonic hero. It would have been interesting to hear from Dr. Jordans whether he thinks Beowulf's heroic success in Heorot in any way connected with the fact that he is not one of the inmates of the hall but a stranger and a wanderer. The Icelandic sagas present no other character that might be placed on a level with Grettir, perhaps with the exception of Gisli Súrsson.

These considerations take us towards a theory of Dr. Jordans where an important principle is involved. To him the hero is the successor of the sorcerer as regards the abating of demonic powers (p. 24). It must be denied that this can be proved from the Icelandic sagas. The colonisation of Iceland made the Norseman resort to more primitive notions and practices than they had already attained in their homeland. On the other hand, the heroical demon-fighter is of common occurrence in the folk-tradition of almost all peoples, whereas the sorcerer only appears at a certain stage of social evolution. Thus the evidence of the facts does not support Dr. Jordans' theory.

The problem as to whether the story of Beowulf's exploits may be taken as reflecting religious notions that prevailed among the early English, is carefully avoided by Dr. Jordans. Yet the historical matter of the poem is Danish, not English. When in the later Middle Ages at certain festivities a killed dragon is exhibited, this is regarded as a reminiscence of Beowulf's dragon-fight (p. 44). Are dragons really so rare in popular rites? From the Shetlands no evidence can be drawn to illustrate the pagan beliefs of the Saxons (p. 67); the islands have a Scandinavian population and belong to the Scandinavian cultural sphere. In fact, the subject would have deserved both a more thorough and a more elaborate treatment.

The booklet swarms with misprints, especially in the quotations from Icelandic texts.

Utrecht.

A. G. VAN HAMEL.

*Geoffrey Chaucers Kleinere Dichtungen, nebst Einleitung, Lesarten, Anmerkungen und einem Wörterverzeichnis.* Neu herausgegeben von JOHN KOCH. pp. viii, 260. (Engl. Textbibliothek herausg. v. J. Hoops, 18.) Heidelberg: Winter. 1928. RM. 8.—.

This excellent critical edition, now five years old, is a welcome successor to the Chaucer Society, Oxford, and Globe editions of the Minor Poems, and takes into consideration recent discussions of date, sources, etc. The edition gives all the poems definitely recognised as authentic except the *Canterbury Tales* and *Troilus and Criseyde*. Of those sometimes accepted as Chaucer's,

Koch omits the *Romaunt of the Rose*, the *Balade of Complaynt*, and *Womanly Noblesse*, but he includes *Newe Fangelnesse*, *Merciles Beautee*, and the *Complaynt d'Amours*.

The introduction gives the chief events of Chaucer's life in annalistic form, and the author then turns to the question of the chronology of the minor poems. He does not give his arguments in full, but refers to his previous work on the subject. On the basis of his conclusions he arranges, for the first time, these poems in chronological order, beginning with the *A.B.C.*, about 1369, and ending with the *Compleynte of Chaucer to his Purse*, in 1399. *The Parlement of Foules* he assigns to the spring of 1382, the *Legend of Good Women* to 1385/6; in the latter he accepts the Cambridge Gg. version of the Prologue as the earlier. The group of poems showing the influence of Boethius (*Fortune*, *Trouthe*, *The Former Age*, *Gentilesse*, *Lak of Stedefastnesse*) he places fairly late, perhaps 1386-1389. The introduction also contains a section on each individual poem, dealing concisely in each case with the title, source, metre, date, and manuscripts, and the inter-relationships of the last.

The text of the poems follows; for each poem this is based on a single manuscript, but the more important variants of the MSS., early printed editions, and later editions are given in footnotes, and some of the variants and additions are introduced into the text (distinguished by italics). Further discussion and justification of the variant readings he has adopted has since been given by Koch in an article in *Anglia: Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Chaucers kleineren Dichtungen* (June, LIII, 1-101.)

The spellings are normalized to some extent, on the basis of forms established by Wild from Chaucer's rhymes; Koch also normalizes final *-e*, adding it where it was historically 'correct' but was omitted by scribes, and omitting it where scribes had added it; thus he substitutes the spellings *greet*, *doon*, etc. for *grete*, *done*, etc.; further, he regularly replaces *i*, *y*, in unstressed syllables by *e*: *-ed*, *-es*, etc. He makes use of diacritics in the text, printing a curve above the line to indicate elision, a dot beneath an unpronounced *e*, an accent over a stressed syllable in cases that might give rise to doubt.

It is perhaps to be regretted that the notes (all very brief) on questions of interpretation, references to parallel passages, etc., should be included in the footnotes among the variant readings. Koch does not deal with Chaucer's language; in the vocabulary, however, he indicates the quality of the stressed vowels; presumably this also is based on Wild.

It is a pity that such a workable book should come to pieces at once if it is not bound.

London.

MARY S. SERJEANTSON.

---

*The Vulgaria of John Stanbridge and the Vulgaria of Robert Whittinton.* Edited with an Introduction and Notes by BEATRICE WHITE, M.A. — Early English Text Society. Original Series, No. 187, 1932. — LXI + 146 pp. Price 12 s.

Miss Beatrice White has performed a useful piece of work, for which all students of English pedagogics will be very grateful. In the introduction

to her book she presents an illuminating survey of the art of teaching which was in use in the Tudor Grammar Schools. Her sketch is of course based on Foster Watson's standard work, but it describes some very interesting aspects of the by-ways of education in the 16th century. We learn that the reform of Latin teaching reached its climax under the auspices of Stanbridge and Whittinton, who, however, were not absolutely original, but followed the footsteps of John Anwykyll who had endeavoured to adapt classical Latin to the exigencies of contemporary English. Miss White also mentions William of Waynflete and John Holt as pioneers of the reform. But it was beyond their capacities to realise fully the difficulties of the average pupil when learning the Latin language. It was the great merit of Stanbridge and Whittinton to see clearly in this respect, and to find right methods to overcome these difficulties. Robert Whittinton has nearly been forgotten, partly in consequence of his tiresome controversies with William Horman, partly because of the increasing influence of Lily. So there was a real need for a detailed analysis of his text-books, for it does not give us a fair view of a period to judge it only by its admired paragons.

The chapter on the "Vulgaria and Latin Teaching" is of great interest, because we are made acquainted with the method of Latin teaching in the schools of the Renaissance. We are shown in what way the pupils had to do their work, how they were taught to manage the Accidence and the composition of verse, to write theses and to dispute in the Latin tongue. So we get a complete picture of the every day school life, based on a thorough study of the sources. It is a pity that Miss White gives but small scope to the School Plays, though they had a greater importance in England than in any other country of Europe at that time.

The second part of the book is devoted to the critical edition of the texts themselves, which is very carefully done with full and copious notes in the appendix. The book is a very scholarly work, and an interesting contribution to the history of the Latin language in England.

Berlin.

P. MEISSNER.

*The Text of King Lear.* By MADELEINE DORAN, Ph. D. 148 pp. Stanford University Press, 1931.

Dr. Doran's treatise is a painstaking contribution to the unsolved problem of Shakespeare's *Lear* text. The present writer, though admiring her scholarly toil, regrets his inability to agree with the most important of her conclusions.

There are three old versions of *King Lear* which might be authoritative: the Q of 1608 sold at the Pide Bull, the Q of 1608 not mentioning the Bull, and the F text of 1623. What were the copies for these editions?

Though the theory was not generally accepted, the Pide Bull Q was considered to be a surreptitious edition made up from shorthand notes. A most representative trio from Germany, America, and England, namely, A. Schmidt (1879), H. H. Furness (1880), and Sir Edmund K. Chambers (1930) concurred in this their assumption. Their arguments, or let us rather say Schmidt's arguments, were built upon the consideration of the following



phenomena: (1) the over-numerous prosodical disturbances (line-shiftings, verse for prose, prose for verse) which best suit the theory of a reported text; (2) the number of mistakes that can be explained by mishearing; (3) some miscorrections which, according to Schmidt, could not have happened if the printer had had an authoritative Ms. at hand; (4) interpolations which Schmidt attributed to the actors when speaking their parts; and (5) omissions: small ones due, according to Schmidt, to the actor's failing memory, and large ones due to the manager's pruning.

It is Dr. Doran's great merit to have decisively refuted Schmidt's theory. Not, however, by convincingly disproving Schmidt's arguments and rightly interpreting the phenomena he leaned on; this she has done only with regard to the mistakes attributable to possible mishearing on which she justly remarks that all printers are liable to make them, and that, therefore, these mistakes have no evidential force in favour of Schmidt's theory. But her all-important argument is this that the Q is far too good to have been a reported play, and that it lacks almost all the characteristics of a surreptitious edition: it has a regular entry in the Stationers' Register, it is considerably longer than any pirated text, it does not contain repetitions of phrases or passages, nor transpositions of scenes, etc. She does not seem to have realized it, but one of her considerations is final. The length of Q consisting of some 3200 lines makes it impossible that Q could represent a reported version of an acted play. Plays did not last longer than  $2\frac{1}{2}$  hours at the utmost. And already a pauseless elocution of 2500 lines would fill up more than the available time. See this periodical, 1930, p. 82.

If Q is not a reported play, what was its copy? The old hypothesis of prompt-book origin Dr. Doran does not consider, but she has another idea:

I believe it to have been Shakespeare's own manuscript. We have seen how unevenly the first quarto is printed, with much of the verse wrongly aligned or printed as prose. I know of no satisfactory way to account for this state of the printed text unless it be that it was printed from a manuscript which contained a good deal of revised and rewritten matter. (p. 122)

Unfortunately, Dr. Doran seems to be indoctrinated with Professor Dover Wilson's views expounded in the New Cambridge Edition. This scholar starts from a premiss like this: "It is a cardinal principle of critical bibliography that when anything is wrong with the text, the blame should be laid rather on the 'copy' than on the compositor" (*The Tempest*, 1921. Introduction, p. XL), and follows it up by reasoning that the copy, being the cause of the prosodical disturbances, must have been rewritten and revised in such a way that the printer could not make out the true alinement of the verse lines; especially the additions on the margin would have led the printer astray. This idea of a much blotted and much corrected Shakespeare original is in flagrant contradiction with the only thing we know about Shakespeare's writings, viz. that Heminge and Condell received from him almost blotless papers. Moreover, in this periodical, 1929, pp. 187/92 we have pointed out that it is a mistake to ascribe bad alinement to confusion in an author's copy because it is a common printer's fault proved beyond doubt by the pretty frequent occurrences of fresh disturbances appearing in pure reprints.

Over against the airy hypothesis, inspired by uncritical bibliography, textual criticism has another tale to tell. The Pide Bull Q represents an adapted prompt-book text, easily diagnosable as such, because it contains non-

Shakespearean insertions, characterized by their redundancy from an author's or reader's point of view, by their extrametricality so that deletion makes the verse lines regular, and by their serviceableness to stage-craft, that is, they make the text more playable and successful by smoothing abruptness, elucidating difficulties of language, and emphasizing and enlivening stage-scenes.

Dr. Doran does not believe in these interpolations, she thinks that Shakespeare wrote the irregular lines in which they appear "pretty much as they stand in the first quarto" (p. 126). If so, how would it be explainable that deletion of 29 redundant words and phrases in the first scene of *Lear* makes the verse structure of the Q text regular? That would be a most miraculous phenomenon, that Shakespeare when writing irregular verses did so by using unnecessary words!

Here are the twenty-nine: *Gloft.* I shall my Leige I, 1, 36; daughter 68; Sir 70; my Lord 89; How 92; to loue my father all 106; So 109; my Lord 109; Peace *Kent* 123; onely 137; of the reft 139; *Kent* 156; to lofe 158; of 159; Now by *Apollo* King 162; thy Gods 163; Heare me ... heare me 169 & 170; away 181; This shall not be reuokt 182; king 183; my noble Lord 191; your Maieftie 226; well en- 228; Goe to, goe to, 236; no more 238; I shall not be his wife 252; come noble *Burgūdy* 269; *Fran.* Bid farewell to your listers? 270; So farewell to you both? 278.

The existence of these interpolations, proving prompt-book origin, together with the fact that Q contains hundreds of lines which could not have been spoken on the stage, and which, therefore, could not have appeared in an expressly made prompt-book, make it quite sure that Q is printed from Shakespeare's autograph adapted for the stage, that is, made into the prompt-book.

Successful bibliographic research by Professor Pollard, Dr. Greg, and others has demonstrated that the Q of 1608 which does not mention the Bull was not printed in 1608 but reprinted from the Pide Bull quarto at Jaggard's printing-office in 1619. Already P. A. Daniel (1885) had shown it to be a reprint but several deviations left some doubt whether the reprinter might have used an authoritative source which entitled him to these deviations. Dr. Doran carefully investigates this question, and comes to the indubitable conclusion that the reprinter had no such source, and that the deviations are his or his press-reader's arbitrary alterations. She also suggests, perhaps quite rightly, that the Jaggard Q was set up by two different printers. And she closes her chapter on the relation between the two quartos with a grand lesson:

A close examination of the characteristics of Q<sub>2</sub> has enabled us to discover what one book printed directly from another may be like, and what mistakes and alterations a printer is liable to make. (p. 38)

The value of her information cannot be estimated too highly. But, if Dr. Doran herself, in respect of the prosodical disturbances, had better taken to heart her own lesson, she would not have concluded to a much revised Shakespeare Ms. as the copy for the Pide Bull Q. For, as said above, wrong alinement is a common printer's fault, and the Jaggard reprint confirms this in a most convincing way. Where there is prose in Q we find in the Jaggard reprint:

wrongly indented I, 4, 89; II, 2, 10; II, 4, 66;  
 wrongly made verse IV, 3, 1/2; IV, 6, 267/74; V, 1, 18/9;  
 rightly made verse but mislineated IV, 7, 83/4; V, 1, 12/3; V, 1, 15/6;  
 rightly corrected into verse V, 1, 31/2; V, 1, 47/9.

Where there is correct verse in Q we find in the Jaggard reprint:  
 mislineated verse I, 1, 181/2; IV, 2, 77/8; IV, 2, 97/8; IV, 7, 29; V, 3, 28/34;  
 V, 3, 108/9; V, 3, 248/9; V, 3, 262/3;  
 wrongly made prose III, 6, 91 (doggerel); V, 3, 236/47; V, 3, 250/4; V, 3, 263/79.

Where there is mislineated verse in Q we find in the Jaggard reprint:  
 deviating mislineated verse I, 1, 246/7; III, 2, 19; III, 3, 15; IV, 1, 64;  
 IV, 2, 56/7; IV, 2, 82/3; IV, 2, 95/6; IV, 7, 1/2; IV, 7, 26/8; V, 1, 57/8;  
 V, 3, 171/2;  
 rightly lineated verse II, 2, 86/8; III, 6, 109/10; IV, 6, 258/9; IV, 6, 291/2;  
 IV, 7, 6/8; IV, 7, 14/5; IV, 7, 57/9; V, 2, 3/4; V, 3, 3/5; V, 3, 174;  
 rightly corrected into prose III, 7, 6/11.

We see Jaggard's workman alining as he thought best. (And his attitude in pointing and spelling was the same.) On pp. 28/30 Dr. Doran deals with these differences of alinement between the two quartos but it does not strike her that these variations extinguish Professor Dover Wilson's will-o'-the-wisp.

In conformity with the general opinion Dr. Doran holds the F version of *Lear* to be "a much superior text" (p. 14) to the Q. This general opinion is largely based on the fact that the alinement of F is so much better. This, however, belongs to the trappings of printing, and has nothing to do with the printer's degree of exactness in setting up the words of his copy. Such minor questions as alinement, punctuation, and spelling scarcely deserve any attention as compared with the paramount problem of the hundreds of variations in wording and phrasing between Q and F. These we have studied in the first scene of *Lear* (some 300 lines), and we have been not a little amazed at finding the Q to be far superior and much more trustworthy than the F text. Subsequently reviewing Dr. Doran's arguments in favour of the superiority of F we have been nightly strengthened in our opinion. She writes :

... the folio gives correct readings for most of the errors in both of the quartos ... The good readings in F are not conjectural emendations, as were so many in Q<sub>2</sub>, but the readings which were evidently in the manuscript from which Q<sub>1</sub> was printed and which were misread by the printer of that text ... On page 39, in note 3, several of the most corrupt passages in the corrected sheets of Q<sub>1</sub> were listed; for these passages the folio gives not only a good reading, but a reading which is evidently original. It will be sufficient to quote one of them.  
 pp. 40/1

Before turning to the one passage Dr. Doran thinks to be sufficient to settle the superiority of F we have to mention that her list on p. 39 is not a formidable one; it contains only three items: I, 4, 320/4; III, 7, 56/65; and IV, 2, 57. The first item yields a bad mistake in Q: *worft* instead of *worth them*, two indeterminable variants (*that* for *which*, and *untented woundings* for *Th'untented woundings*), and twice the legitimate spelling *the* for the modernization *thee*. The third item is a malapropos, for the F text is absent. The second item is the one quoted by Dr. Doran, III, 7, 56/6 :





F changed *friend* (= *friended* = *favoured*) into *found*. What Shakespeare wrote is not dubious. Again, at l. 65 within the compass of seven lines we find a phrase which has been a riddle to all editors and critics. *Cruels* means cruelties. The *NED* documents this signification with an unmistakable quotation from the year 1440. Of the meanings of *subscribe* one perfectly suits, it is registered in *NED* under 8. c.: *to admit one's inferiority*, and it is documented with *I H* 6. II, 4, 44 and *II H* 6. III, 1, 38. Gloucester winds up his peroration on the cruelty of the sisters with: all other cruelties are less (they admit their inferiority) but I shall see *etc.*

As soon as we understand the Q text, compare it with F, and apply the *durior lectio* test, it is abundantly obvious that, over against the three misprints of Q, F has one modernization, *holpe* for *holpt*, and four deliberate changes: *fticke* for *rafh*, *as his bare* for *on his lowd*, *howl'd* for *heard*, and *fterne* for *dearne*. What Dr. Doran brings forward as sufficient proof of F's superiority and its evident genuineness is proof positive of F's inferiority, of F being a much revised text, at the very least one remove farther from the original than Q.

That F represents a revised text Dr. Doran herself maintains. She believes that F "represents the prompt-book, which had been transcribed from the original and subsequently revised and shortened" (pp. 39/40). A prompt-book text, and a revised one, surely it is, as proved by the interpolations it contains. In the first scene F keeps 23 of the 29 cases in Q, and adds seven new ones: *speake* 88; *Lear*. Nothing? 90; *Cor*. Nothing. 91; *O* 163; *Alb*. *Cor*. Dear Sir forbear 164; *recreant* 169; *I am firme* 248.

Here, the most prominent point of difference between Dr. Doran's and our opinion is her belief that Shakespeare himself was the reviser. As she does not support her belief with any arguments, we think it was only her conviction of F's superiority which provoked her belief. We have no room to spare for adding much more of our gathered evidence of F's untrustworthiness; only one telling passage we shall add:

## Q:

His fault is much, and the good King his  
VVill check him for't, your purpoft low  
Is fuch, as bafeft and [con]temneft wretches  
And moft common trespaffes || are punifht  
The King muft take it ill, || that hee's fo  
In his meffenger, || fhould [y'] haue him  
Duke. Ile anwer that. ||

## F:

The King his Mafter, needs muft take it ill  
That he fo flightly valued in his Meffenger,  
Should haue him thus reftained.  
*Cor*. Ile anwere that.

*Lear*. II, 2, 148/54

Pope corrected the line-shiftings in Q. Capell supplied *con-*, and the present writer *y'*. Instead of *meffenger*, here as in II, 1, 126; 2, 54; and 4, 2; we have to read *meffage*, its disyllabic synonym. The *NED* does not register this archaic signification of *message* later than 1475 notwithstanding its occurrence in *LLL* III, 1, 52 Q & F. Hundreds of archaic words in the Shakespeare texts have been changed into more modern equivalents, but this in passing.

According to Dr. Doran's theories these parallel passages must be explained in this way: Shakespeare first wrote the text otherwise than the misaligned passage in Q; subsequently he changed this original text into the misaligned passage, and afterwards, rejecting what he had carefully revised, changed it into the F text. Her acceptance of such a mentality in Shakespeare whose "mind and hand went together" we cannot appreciate. More than that, Shakespeare's revision into the F form is flatly impossible: if the revision had been his, he would have made sense. The omission of *y* is common to both versions, the F has an additional misprint *he* for *hee's*, and this proves that F is one remove farther from the original than Q.

Dr. Doran supposes that F being the prompt-book text "had been transcribed from the original and subsequently revised and shortened." Such a procedure is contrary to common sense. If the manager wanted an expressly made prompt-book, of course the necessary adaptation (revision and shortening) would have been done on the author's Ms. In this way a transcript of the revised and shortened original would furnish the wanted prompt-book. A transcription before the revision had no object whatever. And a transcription after the revision can be ruled out. In that case the excess of several hundred lines, too many to be spoken on the stage, would not have been unnecessarily transcribed. Besides, the F, though shorter than Q, contains some hundred lines which are absent from Q. And these lines must have belonged to Shakespeare's original text because the supposition of their being later additions is utterly improbable since staging had shown that the play was already much too long. Therefore, just as Q, F must have been printed from Shakespeare's adapted (revised) autograph. Thereanent is this difference that the Q represents the state of the Ms as it was in 1608, and the F as it was in 1623 when it had undergone renewed adaptation or revision.

Another question remains. Daniel already advanced that F was partly reprinted from the Pide Bull quarto. Dr. Doran painstakingly investigates the point, and concludes that it was not the first quarto but the Jaggard reprint which was used when the F was set up. We wholeheartedly agree. The F is a blend between the Jaggard reprint and Shakespeare's much adapted autograph as it had become in the year 1623. And, to our thinking, its printing was "ouerseen" by Heminge (or Condell) whose action did not further its trustworthiness.

Erelong we hope to publish a more circumstantial exposition of the results our own study has led to.

The Hague.

B. A. P. VAN DAM.

*An Anthology of Augustan Poetry 1700—1751.* Compiled and edited by FREDERICK T. WOOD. lxix + 323 pp. Macmillan, 1931. Price 7/6.

There are people who profess to think an anthology an impertinence. It is an assault on their private taste, and the only ideal anthology is their own. Much may be said for this, if you are sensitive on the point of honour.



Very little, however, from the practical point of view. In particular, a selection from the dreary waste of Augustan verse being desirable, we have every reason to be thankful to anyone else for taking the trouble to sift the wheat from the chaff for us. And Mr. Wood has made a very catholic choice. Of course there are things to grumble at. Some of the wheat seems to have been lost and a little chaff retained. Our favourite poems from our favourite Augustan, Prior, have not been included, and some comparatively worthless pieces take up space that would have been more profitably filled by the omitted passages of, let us say, Shenstone's *The Schoolmistress*, a poem which is not quite easy to get in its complete form.

On the other hand it does contain the best verse of men whose works are not in our libraries, and whose best verse it is well to know. It contains such comparative rarities as Matthew Green's *The Spleen*, Byrom's witty *Toast* "God bless the King!", Dyer's *Grongar Hill* and *Country Walk*, Hamilton's "Busk ye, busk ye, my bonnie bonnie bride", the best ballad of the ballad revival, Pomfret's *The Choice*, and Parnell's *Nightpiece on Death*. The poems of Stephen Duck — how un-Augustan a name! — Queen Caroline's thresher poet, are a pointed reminder that cornfields and farmhands did exist in those days as well as swains and plains. Indeed by far the biggest section in the book is that of "Nature and the Countryside", the compiler no doubt wishing to emphasize the rural tastes of a generation which is too often regarded as exclusively concerned with the town.

Not the least valuable part of the book is the Introduction,<sup>1</sup> adequately long, moderate in tone, viewing the period in a new analysis to provide a new synthesis. The age is interpreted by taking the poetry to pieces, as it were, under the headings used in the anthology itself. These are Love Poetry, (which reveals how little this age is distinct from that of Suckling and Sedley, except in three lyrics, Carey's delightful *Sally in our Alley*, Gay's *Black-Eyed Susan*, and Ramsay's *My Peggy is a young thing*), Life and Death, Society and Sentimentalism, Nature and the Countryside (already mentioned), the Poetry of Melancholy, Religion (in which the hymns of the Wesleys and Isaac Watt are maliciously relieved by *The Vicar of Bray*), Patriotism (a small group because "aesthetically of the lowest order"), and finally Epigrams, which sends the book out in a shower of squibs. The essay shows the evolution of the age, spiritual and aesthetic, viz., the re-action from the metaphysical style to straightforward, if conventional, expression, from cynicism to melancholy, from elegance to interest in the ugly things of life, as in Cibber's *The Blind Boy*, from the jingoism of *Rule Britannia* to John Scott's anti-war poem *The Drum*, from the taste for a suburban kind of nature — though "the urbanity of Augustan poetry has been considerably overrated" (xxxix) — in which nature was subordinated to man's uses, to nature for its own sake and in its ruder aspects. In all cases references to illustrative poems in the anthology are cited, and thus the essay is also a thoroughly practical guide to the poems that follow. It is the fullest and most satisfactory account of the verse of the period that has yet appeared, and will well repay attention, especially from those who share the common

---

<sup>1</sup> Once or twice there are defects of style surprising in so scholarly an essayist. Surely "beauteous poem" (xxxi) belongs to the 18th century? Can a note adumbrate work (xxxvi)? "A collection of old Scotch songs written before 1600" (xxxvii) and "Gay found a fellow of like temperament in Allan Ramsay" (xlvi) are tautological.

contempt of the age, by showing it in a clearer light and pointing out unsuspected beauties.

Groningen.

J. A. FALCONER.

*The Ballad of Tradition.* By GORDON HALL GEROULD. viii + 311 pp. Oxford. 1932. The Clarendon Press. 12/6 net.

*Bischof Percy's Bearbeitung der Volksballaden und Kunstgedichte seines Folio-Manuskriptes.* Von MARGARETE WILLINSKY. 227 pp. Leipzig, Bernhard Tauchnitz. 1932. (Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie, Heft XXII) RM. 10.

*Literarische Einflüsse in Schottischen Volksballaden.* Von GABRIELE HUMBERT. 117 pp. Halle, Max Niemeyer. 1932. (Studien zur Englischen Philologie, Heft LXXIV.)

Of late a considerable amount of attention has been devoted by scholars to an investigation into the origin and history of the ballad, and these three books represent the most recent contributions to that study. Professor Gerould's work, as its title implies, deals mainly with the older, traditional ballad rather than the later literary type, and the revival of the eighteenth century is equally outside its province; it must be admitted, however, that for the most part it treats its subject in a most competent manner, surveying it from all possible angles. Yet at the outset the reader feels a little disappointed. The opening chapter on "The Nature of the Ballad" does not contain a great deal that is new. It is certainly a clear and concise account of the main characteristics of ballad-literature; it emphasises, for instance, the dramatic elements in the ballads, their impersonal attitude, the compression of the narrative and the centralisation of the story. But to a student of literature all these are commonplace knowledge, and to discuss them at such length seems quite unnecessary. It gives an impression of superficiality; an impression, albeit, which is quite erroneous, for really the book is full of most careful scholarship, founded upon a wealth of reading and research.

The real value only becomes apparent when we get past this initial stage. The work is based (as, of course, any study of the ballad must of necessity be based) upon the valuable collection made by Child; yet while using this as a foundation, Professor Gerould casts considerable doubt on what he calls its "authoritative completeness"; and rightly so. Gummere might feel that, unless we are to take Child's lists as the ultimate authority "all boundaries of the subject are obscured"; but as our author remarks, "a ballad is either a ballad because it conforms to a certain definition as to form and transmission, or it is not a ballad at all. Its inclusion in Child's volume has nothing to do with the matter". No-one, least of all Professor Gerould, would wish to under-rate Child's scholarship: the yeoman work which he did in rescuing so many of these old songs from oblivion can never be sufficiently praised; but to regard his judgement as infallible and his collection as sacrosanct would certainly be the last thing a scholar of his eminence would desire.

For the majority of students the chief interest of the present work will centre around four points; viz. the question of the origin of the ballad *genre*, the equally important question of artistry, a discussion of ballad tunes, and an attempt to elucidate the thorny problem of the refrain which occurs in so many of these old poems, often without any conceivable relation to the stanza to which it is attached. On the question of origins Professor Gerould is diametrically opposed to the view generally accepted. The ballad, he urges, is essentially a mediaeval development; our earlier ancestors certainly made poetry, and handed it on orally from generation to generation, but it was fundamentally different from the ballad, as a study of the songs sung at the feast of Hrothgar (in *Beowulf*) will prove, and it is therefore an error to suppose, as has been supposed, that the ballad goes back to a primitive culture. It is a tradition no older, probably, than some seven or eight hundred years.

If the reader feels inclined to cross swords with the author over this issue, still more strongly will he dispute the point when Professor Gerould goes on to urge, as he does in two different chapters, that the origin of the ballads was not communal, as is usually supposed, but individual. "Individuals, we must suppose, fashioned the earliest ballads..... Some of them were professional entertainers or minstrels..... The references to ballad-singing in the earlier days give not the slightest hint of what may be called co-operative composition..... At all times and in all places individual composition has been the rule." This as the conclusion of some thirty pages of evidence.

From these premises follows the next point; namely, that far from being spontaneous, artless productions of a simple and untutored "group mind", the ballads are characterised by an artistry all their own. "Ballads are very far from being primitive poetry; indeed, they are rather the flower of an art, formalised and developed among people whose training has been oral instead of visual..... The basic structure of the ballad does, in fact, show narrative art at a high pitch." I must confess that all of this seems to me a little doubtful. It is easy enough to make sweeping statements, especially when playing the iconoclast or disputing an idea that is generally accepted, but to substantiate them so that they convince others is no easy matter, and Professor Gerould has not altogether surmounted the difficulty. What he has to say on the refrain, however, is more guarded. He estimates that more than half our British ballads have been sung with refrains, while on the other hand there are some in which a refrain never occurs, and to explain this phenomenon he suggests that there were two different sources: 1) the dance-song, which had a refrain, and 2) the minstrel's song, which had none. This, we must admit, seems a credible explanation.

A particularly pleasing feature of the book is the inclusion of an entire chapter devoted to ballad-tunes. Seeing that originally the tunes were so essential a part of the ballads, one wonders that this aspect has not received more attention before. Perhaps it is because our knowledge of mediaeval music is so scanty, for Professor Gerould admits that even after protracted research he is unable to come to any definite conclusion about them; but from the evidence he has adduced, one thing does seem plain: one of the most potent influences in shaping the tunes was ecclesiastical music. It seems justifiable to believe in some sort of influence from the Latin hymns of the Church.

If these are the four main centres of interest, there are also other aspects of the subject that deserve attention. In the chapter on "Ballad Stories", for



instance, after commenting on the absence of religious or moral motives, the author has shown how the salient features of mediaeval life and culture are intimately woven into the texture of the ballads. In Child's collection no less than one third of the poems deal with love or sex, sixty with fights, fifty-four with feats of arms, seventy-five with family relations, and nearly half of this number introduce the motive of manslaughter. The author is careful to point out, however, that these facts are not peculiar to English ballads, for the ballad stories transcend all national and tribal boundaries. No doubt they had a local origin at one time, but it is now all but impossible to determine where. The ballad of *Lord Randal*, for instance, has been found in Scotland and Sweden, in Calabria, in Hungary, and in Czecho-Slovakia.

The chapter on "Ballads and Broadsides", again, deserves careful study, especially by students of the Restoration and eighteenth century, while the final section on the American ballad and the negro songs introduces us to a field which few writers have attempted to explore. Some of Professor Gerould's conclusions are disputable and controversial. In the case of *Lord Randal*, for instance, he is inclined to the belief that the ballad was carried by word of mouth from the locality of its origin to the various lands where it is now to be found; but a far more credible explanation is surely that of a common origin, of which each of the modern versions is an independent development. But for all this, the fact remains that the author of this book has done a most valuable piece of work, for which all students of ballad literature owe him a debt of gratitude.

And now let us turn to the second of these studies, that of Dr. Willinsky. As every student of literature knows, the first person to stimulate anything like a scholarly interest in the ballads was Thomas Percy, the author of the *Reliques of Antient English Poetry*, and it is with him and his work that Dr. Willinsky deals in a doctoral dissertation that is a real contribution to our knowledge of both the by-ways of eighteenth-century literature and that memorable collection which will always be associated with Percy's name. Percy claimed that the greater part of his ballads were taken from "an old folio-manuscript in the editor's possession, which contains near two hundred poems, songs, and metrical romances"; as a matter of fact, as Dr. Willinsky has shown by a comparison of Percy's text with the edition of the folio-manuscript published by Furnivall in 1868, only forty-six of the poems actually came from this source. The rest were taken from the collections of Pepys, Anthony à Wood, and various other manuscripts. The main object of the present treatise is to subject to a careful examination each of the forty-six ballads, and to demonstrate the use that Percy made of his source as well as the directions in which he introduced modifications of his own.

On the whole, one must admit, the author has done her work well. With characteristic thoroughness she has taken each of the ballads in turn and has subjected it to a careful analysis, comparing it at every stage with the folio original; and where she has found any great discrepancy between the two she has sought to trace out all possible or likely sources for the variants. This method has, of course, its disadvantages; it sometimes savours over-much of the mechanical. But this is more than counter-balanced by the resulting merits of clarity and methodical arrangement; and it renders the book very easy for reference. Dr. Willinsky has thrown light upon several questions about Percy and his collaborators which have hitherto been obscure. She

has made clear, for instance, the part that Shenstone played in the compilation of the collection; she has shown that contrary to general belief and to Shenstone's own claim, it was not he who first suggested such an edition, but Percy's friend Johnson, though Shenstone soon lent his encouragement and gave all the practical help in his power. (See particularly pp. 28-32). She has fallen into an error, however, on pages 53-54, where she attributes the revision of *The Boy and the Mantle* to Percy himself. In *The Library* (*Transactions of the Bibliographical Society*, Oxford) for 1928, Mr. L. F. Powell has shown fairly conclusively that the "modern hand" which altered this poem was no other than Shenstone's. A statement on page 24 regarding the publication of D'Urfey's *Pills to Purge Melancholy* is also a little misleading. This book first appeared in 1699; the edition of 1719, to which reference is made, was actually the fourth. But these, after all, are minor faults. In the main the analyses, founded upon careful and untiring research, are accurate; and especially informative is the section, all too short, which deals with the typically eighteenth-century and romantic elements in Percy's attitude to the old ballads. "Deutlich spricht aus seinen Balladenbearbeitungen", writes Dr. Willinsky, "der sentimentale, tränenreiche Geist des 18 Jahrhunderts, der zu den primitiven, schlichten Gestalten der alten Balladen im Widerspruch steht, denn ein rührseliges Weinen und Klagen ist nicht der Ausdruck des primitiven Naturzustandes; es entspringt vielmehr der sentimentalischen Selbstbespiegelung des romantischen 18 Jahrhunderts. Romantisch ist auch die moralisierende Tendenz, die der Bischof in die alten Fabeln hineinbringt. Romantisch auch seine Vorliebe für die wunderbaren, märchenhaften Abenteuer und Geschehnisse: die Kämpfe mit Riesen und Drachen, die Verwandlungen und Verzauberungen, die in seinen eigenen Hinzufügungen zum Ausdruck kommen."

On the general literary background of the *Reliques*, however, Dr. Willinsky's accuracy is a little more questionable. Quite rightly she insists upon the cult of the melancholy school as one of the motives making for the popularity of the ballads, but she never shows very distinctly how the two were connected. That both were symbolic of a flight from the present, the rational and the material that had so dominated the first half of the eighteenth century, would seem to be one of the most important links between them, while in some cases both were affected cults of the dilettante who was bored with life as he found it. Neither of these aspects is touched upon; nor, in the present writer's opinion, is the influence of Spenser sufficiently stressed. But, what is even more serious, the author is prone to make sweeping statements which need considerable qualification. One reads on page 11, to take but a single example, the following assertion about the literature of the Restoration. "Die Literatur stand nicht nur formal unter dem Einfluss der Franzosen, auch inhaltlich folgte man französischen Vorbildern. *Das Drama lebt ganz von Molière und Racine.*" (Italics my own). This idea of Restoration drama may have been accepted ten or twelve years ago, but since then the researches of such scholars as Professor Allardyce Nicoll have proved its falsity. Basically English drama was still following in the native tradition, and besides the comedy of manners, between the years 1660 and 1700 there was a strong school, headed by Shadwell, which was carrying on the Jonsonian comedy of humours. Attention to such points as these would have removed several blemishes from a valuable piece of work.

Finally there is Dr. Humbert's book, an essay in comparative ballad criticism. The author believes that in many of the Scottish ballads a considerable literary, as distinct from a folk element is discernible, and by a study of different versions of the same songs he attempts to determine the precise nature and extent of this influence. Basing his study on the "Aberdeen Ballads", published some eight or nine years ago by Alexander Keith, he carefully collates each poem, wherever it is possible to do so, with the version given by Child, by manuscripts, or by any other available sources. The work is done conscientiously and well, and reveals many illuminating facts about the growth of these old ballads. Where there are several versions, for instance, when arranged chronologically they show an increased intrusion of the literary element; the simplicity and naïveté of tone gradually vanish, and are replaced by something much more consciously artistic, while the diction and metre both tend to become more sophisticated. Naturally, no conclusion can be reached about the collection as a whole, but on individual ballads Dr. Humbert has thrown interesting sidelights.

[Postscript. A student of Dr. Humbert's book should also read side by side with it a most illuminating study of the ballad recently published in *Anglia* by Wolfgang Schmidt under the title *Die Entwicklung der Englisch-Schottischen Volksballaden*.<sup>1</sup> As is only to be expected, this treatise overlaps both Dr. Humbert's and Professor Gerould's work at several points, but on the other hand, much of the material contained in it is to be found in neither of the previous works. As the title suggests, Dr. Schmidt has set himself the task of tracing out the evolution of the folk ballad and its many ramifications, and with the characteristic thoroughness of all his countrymen has spared no pains in his enquiry. As the result of exhaustive investigations, partly historical and partly critical, he comes to the conclusion that the English and Scottish ballads must be regarded as two distinct species, which have developed along different lines; for while traces of the professional reciter still remain in the earlier English ballads, the Scottish ballads seem to have had their origin in the clan-tradition, and then to have fallen under Scandinavian influence. The Robin Hood and the heroic ballads, which are again a class apart, have probably received their characteristic tone from the yeomanry of the northern lands, to whom we are indebted for their preservation. All ballads, however, Dr. Schmidt agrees, have this in common: that for many years they were handed on by oral tradition, and to this fact we owe two of their principal characteristics: i.e. the dramatic or picturesque elements, and the sociological elements, which accumulated around them in the course of transmission. The articles are copiously annotated, and the nine pages of bibliography are most valuable in themselves, quite apart from their relation to the main part of the study.]

Sheffield.

FREDERICK T. WOOD,

---

*Robert Browning and the Twentieth Century. Browning's Influence and Reputation.* By A. BROCKINGTON. Oxford University Press 1932, 300 pp., 15 sh.

This book looks less like "a thesis approved for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of London," than like a series of lectures, agreeable to read, showing a fine literary culture, but not "scientific" in the limited sense we can give to the word in literary history and criticism.

Not that there is not something to learn from it. There are interesting quotations, a letter from Browning to Miss Blagden about Tennyson (80),

<sup>1</sup> *Anglia*, Band LVII, Heft 1 and 2., January 1933, April 1933.



a letter of Ruskin in 1859 on the *Idylls of the King* (102). Here and there Mr. Brockington proves the influence of Browning, by an echo of *Abt Vogler* in Davidson (54), another echo in Meredith's *Alsace Lorraine* (85). But, as a rule, he is too vague and takes for granted what he ought to prove.

In the first part of the book, Browning is the pretext for a few rapid essays on Davidson, Kipling, Masfield, Meredith, Davies, supposed to be linked together and to Browning by their *realism*; as if realism had not begun before Browning, in Crabbe, in Wordsworth (a passage of Davies, on p. 71, reminds me much more of Wordsworth than of Browning), as if it was not a general feature in XIXth century Europe, due partly to social causes, partly to scientific curiosity.

The author is less superficial when he speaks of the dramatic monologue, which he prefers to call *dramatic lyric*, because it generally consists in an imaginary *conversation* reported by one person, in colloquial style.

It is possible that Meredith adopted this method from Browning in the *Ordeal of Richard Feverel* (135); it is more dubious that Conrad consciously did so in his novel *Chance* and, as to Housman, he openly disclaims the influence (90).

Another chief point is Browning's Optimism. The author explains that this optimism is not summed up in "All's right with the world" and that Browning had a keen sense of the miseries of life. There is, by the way, an excellent analysis of *Ixion*. But Mr. Brockington says nothing to convince us that the optimism he finds in Walter de la Mare, in Rupert Brooke, Laurence Binyon and Robert Bridges is derived from Browning. He then treats of the "Reaction against Optimism." I grant that Hardy is pessimistic, that there is in him, as in Housman, a "spirit of negation." But that Hardy was pessimistic *against* Browning seems to me more difficult to believe than that he wrote the *Dynasts* in a sort of emulation with *The Ring and the Book*. Hardy is the intellectual son of Darwinism and of the scientific outlook on the world.

The author concludes by examining Browning's reputation as a lover and as a "mystic". He is very insistent on the point that there was but one woman in Browning's life, which has nothing to do with the main subject. The chapter on Mysticism omits to speak of Browning's poems on Music. The book lacks unity of design. But its chief fault is that it surmises influence wherever it finds resemblance.

In a book on Browning I myself made a study of his elliptical and allusive style, which requires so great an effort on the part of the reader, and I showed the analogy of this style with that of some recent French writers such as Cocteau, Giraudoux, Morand; but I never assumed that they had imitated him, and it is probable that they never read a line of his. This ought to make us cautious as regards English writers. Analogies may be due to general causes. I believe with some psychologists that the more a civilization becomes complicated and diversified, the more rapid the stream of associations and the more numerous the things implied between speaker and hearer. Browning was before his age in this tendency, but it does not follow that the next age imitates him whenever it proceeds in the same way.

*Neuenglische Stilistik.* Von DR. MAX DEUTSCHBEIN. Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer, 1932. Pp. XII, 187. RM. 5.—.

A young friend, wise beyond his age, once said to me in the course of an after-lessons conversation: "Talking about style, sir, is like holding the devil by the tail; and you never get as much as a good hold on to that". Having rebuked him for his regrettable indifference to refined metaphor, and put him right on one or two minor points, I could not but admit that there was much wisdom in the saying. Of all the things and notions with which dealers in human speech are concerned there is none more elusive than that quality of it to which we habitually refer as style. And yet there seems to be no reason why this should be so. *Style*, as used by the average educated man, refers to the way in which we use words to convey meaning. In this sense every man who puts pen to paper has style, good or bad as the case may be, quite as much as the tennis-player who complains that these tight-fitting jerseys cramp his *style*, as the wrestler who prefers the Greco-Roman *style* to the rougher methods of catch-as-catch-can. About this obvious meaning of style there ought to be no dissensus of opinion. But scholars will go on to analyse style and discuss the ingredients that go to the making of it, and in doing so they gradually shift their ground and begin to discuss, not style, but good style, that is what they consider good style, without regard to the personality of the stylist, the functions of speech and the purpose of the writer. Then controversy comes in and the floodgates of endless talk and writing are opened: personal views are exhibited as eternal verities, statement takes the place of argument, thought grows thinner as verbiage becomes more copious. No wonder that hard-headed critics like Matthew Arnold, Mr. Mencken and Samuel Butler will have nothing to say to the theorizing about style and the teaching of style and insist on concentration on the thought underlying it. Their words are worth quoting. "People think that I can teach them style", Matthew Arnold once said to George W. E. Russell. "What stuff it all is. Have something to say and say it as clearly as you can, that is the only secret of style". Mr. Russell adds that the dictum applies at least as well to conversation as to literature. More forcibly Mr. Mencken: "With precious few exceptions, all the books on style in English are written by writers quite unable to write. The subject, indeed, seems to exercise a special and dreadful fascination over schoolmasters and other such pseudo-literates..... In solemn texts they set forth their depressing ideas about it, and millions of suffering schoolboys have to study what they say. Their central aim is, of course, to reduce the whole thing to a series of 'simple rules', though 'the essence of a sound style is that it cannot be reduced to rules — that it is a living and breathing thing, ..... that it fits its proprietor tightly and yet ever so loosely, as his skin fits him. It is in fact quite as securely an integral part of him as that skin is. If he has fed well it is mellow. If he has gastritis it is bitter. In brief, a style is always the outward and visible symbol of a man and it cannot be anything else. To attempt to teach it is as silly as to set up courses in making love." Similarly Samuel Butler, in an essay written more than thirty years ago, "cannot conceive how any man can take thought for his style without loss to himself and his readers..... A man may and ought to take a great deal of pains to write clearly, tersely..... he will write many a sentence three or four times — to do much more than this is worse than not writing at all ..... but

in each case he will be thinking not of his own style but of his reader's convenience."

Now it must not be supposed that on these views Prof. Deutschbein's attempt to introduce young Germans to the "Land der schönen Formen, der Stilistik", stands condemned as an inept piece of work that starts from and leads nowhere. His *Stilistik*, like Bally's *Traité de Stylistique Française* and *Précis de Stylistique*, does not in the first place deal with the way in which words are used to convey meaning; it is rather, to speak with Mr. Emil Winkler, a refined kind of grammar — grammar taken in its widest sense — it is a treatise on linguistic usage and right expression, for which advanced idiom would be a better label. Not that Prof. Deutschbein's book does not contain a number of pronouncements on style proper, but these are not the best part of the book, besides being mostly quotations from English authors, consisting of primer platitudes, vague general statements and much highly debatable stuff. There may be those to whom Mr. Read's: "All true expression is spontaneous. Style is spontaneity" (p. 9), and Galsworthy's "The soul of good expression is unexpectedness which still keeps to the mark of meaning and does not betray truth" convey something; to me these phrases are meaningless and for my own part I would rather listen to Tom Walcot's<sup>1</sup> "What I want in literature is guts and glow. And when I say guts, I mean guts and when I say glow I mean glow" than to an unexpectedness that does not betray truth. I can only wonder that the author of *Stilistik* is satisfied with such a terminology. The true value of the book will have to be sought in the idiomatic and grammatical parts. But it should be remarked that here again the author quotes largely from various sources, so largely in fact, and, as regards quality, so indiscriminately that his book can be called an original work in a very restricted sense only. As regards his own contributions there is a tone of finality and quiet dogmatism about them which is quite out of place in a work on style and values and is not at all supported by the conviction they carry. Moreover there is about the work a lack of originality, both in general scheme and the illustrative examples, which reduces it to the status of an elaborate compilation and makes it heavy going even to the trained reader. There is the ubiquitous Miss Sharp, whose *appearing* has been insisted upon in continental grammars for the last twenty years: there is the *room, nice and warm* as it was when I was two score years younger; there are the usual euphemistic substitutes for *bloody* and *damned* that have of late years adorned the pages of virile young graduates, eager for a situation and a small addition to their incomes. It is time we were given a change of diet.

To give an example of the summary way in which idiom is dealt with let us take the phrase to *leap to the eye*. Says the author on page 5: "So ist der Satz: this distinction *leaps to the eye* grammatisch korrekt, stylistisch aber unmöglich, da das Englische diese im Deutschen gebräuchliche Metapher nicht kennt". To the reviewer both statement and added reason are wrong. True, there is Mr. H. W. Fowler's authority to support the statement, if not the reason. (*Mod. Engl. Usage*, p. 251). But questions concerning the idiomatic correctness of a phrase "do shoot back" as Bacon has it, "like a Tartar's bow" on those who would ban it. The very question raised as

<sup>1</sup> In a Fleet Street novel *Prestige*, by J. A. T. Lloyd, Stanley Paul & Co, p. 74



to its lawfulness supposes that it has obtained a certain standing. Once its footing has become firm enough, the expression is thereby a legitimate English idiom. To the writer of the review in the Times Literary Supplement, quoted on p. 5, the phrase *to leap to the eye* is clearly an English idiom. To Mr. A. H. Gardiner it seems to come as easy as the rest of his excellently written book on "Speech and Language", p. 210. I may add that I have come across the expression perhaps a dozen times in the last two years or so; though, not having the card-index habit, I cannot recover the references. Add to this that March's *Thesaurus* and Mr. Poutsma's *Do you speak English* as well as *Ten Bruggencate's* dictionary, 12th edition, all record the expression — and the fact emerges that *to leap to the eye* is a well-authenticated English idiom. Besides, if it were not, it still would not be "stilistisch unmöglich" but a lawful English *metaphor*. The question cannot be settled by an appeal to the genius of the English language; these linguistic fictions are better kept out of scientific argument. But we may perhaps, with a fair chance of success, try to find an answer to the question: How would a born Englishman be likely to react on first hearing the expression? His reaction will depend upon past linguistic experiences, his stock of idiomatic phrases, his own way of handling metaphor. We may suppose that the following expressions are part of the linguistic experiences of the average Englishman:

*it strikes the eye;*

*it catches the eye;*

*it hits you in the eye;*

*it meets the eye;*

*it leaps to the mind;*

'the predication *springs to our mind* and also *to our lips*, if we decide that it shall.' (Gardiner).

You can't fail to notice the over-coloured patches, they simply *jump at you* (coined);

or — to use a piece of artistic slang with which the reader will be familiar — *that man jumped in that room* as in any room he entered.

To these may be added an engram or two from punctum saliens, salient point, which, though etymologically misunderstood, lend support to the incriminated phrase. All these expressions conspire to form a well-defined idiomatic area in the "Taaltuin" of the English language, in which the phrase *to leap to the eye*, so far from feeling a stranger in a strange land, ought to feel thoroughly at home.

This is not the only instance of the author's hastiness in arriving at conclusions, nor is it the only time that the author shows himself an extraordinary adept in reading his own recondite ideas into a passage or phrase, whether for the sake of putting it into a definite class or reducing it to some new rule. Indeed, the whole book abounds in rules and classifications and formulations and interpretations which are a weariness to the reader and as often as not challenge criticism. On pp. 93 and 94 we are given a collection of as ..... as *Vergleiche*, as usual divided and subdivided into various classes, this time into similes taken from the animal kingdom, the professions, trades, tools and other things. A full page of observations is then added, with all of which, or nearly all of which, I disagree. The author says: "Es fällt auf, dass für die Bildsphäre am stärksten zum *Vergleiche* herangezogen wird die Welt der lebenden Wesen, Gruppe a) und b). Hierher ist auch die

Gruppe c)<sup>1</sup> zu rechnen, da offenbar die Volkssprache den Gebrauchsgegenständen und Instrumenten vielfach eine persönliche Bedeutung unterlegt. So wird das Suffix *-er* nicht nur für Personen verwandt, sondern auch für Werkzeuge aller Art, z.B. *Poker*, *mower*, *sleepers* (sic) = *sleeping-car*, oder im Slang: *footer* = *football*. Auch werden diese Gegenstände häufig personifiziert."

All this is unintelligible to me. Does the author seriously mean that in the expressions quoted below we attach a personal meaning to *lath*, *post*, *die*, *button*? Does he want us to believe that, in the same way ('so') the suffix *-er* is used in *Poker*, *mower*, *sleepers*, *footer*, and further that these things ('diese Gegenstände') are often personified? Here again the author has been seeing and explaining things which are not.

In the second observation the author avers: "Gegenüber den zahlreichen Beispielen aus der Tierwelt tritt die Pflanzenwelt fast völlig zurück. Collinson gibt nur *as cool as a cucumber*, und die wenigen Beispiele die Poutsma gibt stammen charakteristischerweise aus Thackeray: *as fresh as a rose*, *as fresh as a bean*, *as happy as a rosetree in sunshine*. Ebenso hat G. Eliot auch derartige Vergleiche. Sie sind offenbar spontaner Art." Nearly all the statements in this paragraph are open to question. Why the three similes are *significantly* taken from Thackeray we should like to be informed. That George Eliot has such similes is irrelevant since dozens of authors have them. Whether they are *offenbar spontaner Art* depends on whether they show any creative activity in the author or not. *As cool as a cucumber* is not 'spontaner Art', no more than *as fresh as a rose*, both are clichés. Whether *as fresh as a bean*, *as happy as a rose in sunshine* are spontaneous creations, I cannot tell, they are not familiar to me, and if they were not familiar to Thackeray, they may be called 'spontaner Art'; it is impossible to tell. However, let that pass. But are the plant similes really so hopelessly in the minority as compared with the similes taken from the animal kingdom?

Quoting from a memory that is no longer as good as it used to be, I find the following: *as tall as a poplar*, *as tough as a pine-knot*, *as black as sloes*, *as brown as a berry*, *as fresh as a daisy*, *as like as two peas in a pod*, *as green as grass*, *as yellow as a quince*, *as cheap (common) as blackberries*, *as thick as hops*, *as fair as a lily*, *as welcome as flowers in May*, *as red as a rose*, *as red as a beetroot*, *as sour as a crab*, *as round as an orange*, *as flexible as a willow-wand*, *as brown as a quartered apple*, *as brown as a hickory nut (U.S.)* ..... possibly there may be more, vanished down some crack in my memory, which I cannot now bring up. As regards similes that show the author's creative mind they may be found in numbers in modern authors from Blackmore and Richard Jefferies to Meredith and Hardy. We are all familiar with Moore's

As the sunflower turns to her god when he sets  
The same look which she turned when he rose,

and perhaps with Blackmore's: "He was so wrinkled and wizened up like a pippin which has been out overnight in a frost." Stella Benson recently concluded an excellent short story in the Strand Magazine: "Rare as an

<sup>1</sup> Under group c) are given such expressions as: *as thin as a lath*, *as deaf as a post*, *as straight as a die*, *as bright as a button*.

eclipse, rare as the flowering of the aloe, but it does sometimes happen."

There can be no doubt that the author, from the scanty examples given by Collinson and Poutsma, has allowed himself to be drawn into forming hasty conclusions.

The same rashness appears in the chapters on the Adjective pp. 109-124. The author has persuaded himself and is at pains to persuade others that good English writers are adjective-shy, and from various quotations we are left to infer that the fewer the adjectives the better the author and his style. The sober truth of the matter is, that since adjectives lend themselves more than other parts of speech to over-writing and lurid descriptions writers on style are a little over-emphatic in warning their readers against excessive use of epithets. The word *adjective* so often occurs in the sense of *pannus purpureus* that something of this meaning has, at least contextually, come to cling to it, become inherent in it. A respectable church-goer will complain to his wife at lunch: The new curate's sermon this morning was too awful, a mere muddle of adjectives such as one hears from the soap-box in Hyde Park; or a recently appointed sub-editor will complain that his chief has ripped out all his best adjectives; or he will encourage a fellow struggler: I always go to your paragraphs whenever I am hunting for real toothy adjectives. Bertie Wooster in the travail of his soul will approach his imperturbable butler with: "What's the adjective I want, Jeeves?", to be rewarded by: "cataclysmal, sir, phantasmal, elemental....." Very instructive are the words of the wise youth Colin putting wise his friend Bron Garth, who had been ridiculed by the form master Chaytor Tonge for a really very good essay on rivers, "Want another good tip? Look after your adjectives first. The jus' so adjective is what Tongs wants. Gold is red, Buccleuchs is bold, taste is execrable, villagers is apple-faced." But the author of this delightful bit of irony, the late C. E. Montague<sup>1</sup> when introducing 'Tongs' to the reader does so — and does it effectively — in a passage which fairly swarms with adjectives — and C. E. Montague as a stylist ranks far higher than any of the authorities quoted by Prof. Deutschbein in support of his insupportable thesis.

On page 119 distinction is made between descriptive and classifying adjectives. "Zunächst scheint es alsob die Sprache auf diese (klassifizierenden) Adjektive nicht verzichten könnte." Language, indeed, cannot and does not forgo them; and if the author wishes to convince us of his own — opposite — opinion he will have to produce something more substantial than three synonyms for 'Nebel' and a further three "für den Rehbock." In parentheses I note that 'fawn' is used for the young of any of the deer-kind — red, fallow, or roe, or even moose or wapiti —; as regards the young of the first year fawn is mostly used of the fallow deer; pricket and sorrel (the latter obsolete) of the fallow deer only. What Mr. Quiller-Couch and Mr. Dent have to say about classifications is a counsel of impossibility rather than perfection; it would be a perfection to which we cannot and shall never attain. The essence of all speech is predication, and predication, rightly understood, is classifying; and classifying is naturally done, apart from the verb, finite or other, by adjectives. Warning the student against classifying — presumably in favour of some other mode of predication — is about as useful as it would be for a naturalist to warn mankind against the uses of

<sup>1</sup> In *Rough Justice*, Chatto and Windus, p. 99.



eyes from a mistaken notion that the pineal gland might, with advantage to the species, be revived to its pristine functions.

There is, it is true, a kind of classification of which the true-born Britisher is by nature distrustful. He would listen with grave suspicion to L. Jordan (*Idg. Forsch.* 44, 85) telling him: To explain is to *classify* and to *arrange*, it cannot be anything else; though he would rather chuckle at Willa Cather's (*Death comes for the Archbishop*): "The Germans classify, the French arrange"; but he would be positively up in arms against a recent contributor to the *London News* (June 25th, 1932) who insisted on classifying the various risings of a trout to the fly — instead of teaching him how to catch it. But these classifications have nothing to do with those that occur in a context dealing with the uses of adjectives.

Reference has been made to the author's uncritical attitude to his sources and the quotations he borrows from them. Of these two more instances may be given. Mr. Grattan is quoted on page 124 ".....if we wish, as for instance in the description of things in scientific language, to convey thoughts freed as far as possible from any subjective colouring, then *he walks quickly* is a better construction (than *he hurried*)". Which of the two expressions is better cannot be determined without context, but if Mr. Grattan and Prof. Deutschbein think that *he hurried* has the stronger subjective colouring they are both mistaken. *To hurry* may imply a certain eagerness or undue haste on the part of the walker; as far as the statement or the person making it is concerned the eagerness and haste are quite as objective as the fast walking, though of a different nature, and therefore, at least for the reason given, *he walked quickly* cannot be claimed as the better expression. On page 134 there is a more startling quotation from Mr. Dent's *Britain and Germany*, p. 180, approved by Prof. Deutschbein. "The German thinker is hampered by his language. Its constructions allow him to sweep up every fragment of an idea, however subsidiary to his main contention, into one vast sentence. English compels the thinker to discard the superfluous." The reader may well ask if he is expected to believe this solemn nonsense; I for one find it hard to conceive that Prof. Deutschbein does. The German people are no more hampered by their language than were Goethe and Schiller: if they were they would have changed it long ago. An individual may for various reasons be hampered in his thoughts by his language; taking the people and their language by and large it is the language that follows the thought, not vice versa. The German tongue fits the Germans and their way of thinking like a glove, to them it is a working skin which serves them well and comfortably and which they could not in good health exchange for another.

On pages 180-183 we are told for the hundredth time about the Englishman's morbid dislike of all that is showy and dramatic in expression, about his habit of understatement, his reticence and all the rest of it. Of course there are modest, reticent, self-effacing Englishmen as there are modest, and reticent and self-effacing Germans, Italians and Swedes. But to credit the English as a nation with these virtues is, at any rate in post-war England, alarmingly wide of the mark. As early as 1915 Arthur Waugh in a volume inscribed "Reticence in Literature" wrote: "Reticence is not a national characteristic, far otherwise." And in a further chapter he deplores the widespread abuse of the superlative; he finds it typical of a large amount of current criticism and ordinary descriptive literature. If the present-day English

character as shown in modern literature, especially fictional, biographical and autobiographical, is to be assigned a place in the interval between reticence and modesty on the one hand, and publicity and exhibitionism on the other that place will be nearer the latter than the former.

I noticed a few misprints, of which Robert Lyad is very offensive to the eve. Wanderers Nachtlied as the title of Goethe's gem: "Ueber allen Wipfeln ist Ruh..." is rather a bad lapse of memory in a German professor. And he need not have warned us against the hackneyed metonymy of "the pen is mightier than the thought". Even if we drop the second article, thereby turning the phrase into more comfortable English, it is quite novel and I don't know what it means. Does the author refer to Bulwer Lytton's "The pen is mightier than the sword?"

In the above paragraphs I have made it clear that I think the *Stilistik* a very unsatisfactory book and I must leave it at that. I have never read another book by Prof. Deutschbein and his last production leaves me, I am afraid, without incentive to repair the omission.

Amsterdam.

C. VAN SPAENDONCK.

*The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles.*  
Prepared by WILLIAM LITTLE, H. W. FOWLER, and J. COULSON.  
Revised and edited by C. T. ONIONS. Oxford, Clarendon Press,  
1933, 2 vols. Demy 4to, pp. 2500 (Blue buckram, 63s. net.)

In his preface Dr. C. T. Onions, who has assumed the task of revising and editing this dictionary, reminds us that the need for an abridged form of the *Oxford English Dictionary* (hereafter abridged as *OED*) was envisaged as far back as 1879, that is to say when the Delegates of the Oxford University Press entered into an agreement with the Philological Society for the publication of the *OED*. But it was not until 1902 that this project was initiated. The staff and the editors of the principal work were then too busy to think of working upon this abridgment. A scholar from outside was found in the person of the late William Little, Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, who began compiling the *Shorter OED* in 1903 "as a solace", we are told, "for the complete deafness which had come upon him, cutting off his work as a tutor in philosophy and a lawyer." The work was carried on steadily by him until his death in 1922. He had prepared alone the manuscript for the letters A to T and V. The gaps in the manuscript copy were filled by Mr. H. W. Fowler who abridged V and X, Y, Z and by Mrs. E. A. Coulson who was responsible for W. Dr. Onions was also assisted in his task of revision by several members of the *OED* staff. The work was announced by the press several years in advance and at last came out in February of this year; the first printing was immediately exhausted and a second printing with corrections was issued in the next month. It is to be expected that many other printings will follow and will thus afford opportunities for further corrections and additions and for keeping this admirable work up-to-date.

To give a detailed description of the *Shorter OED* would be at the same time tedious and, probably, superfluous. For we may take it for granted that

if all the readers of *English Studies* are not fortunate enough to possess a copy of the *OED*, at least there is not one among them who has not had occasion to see and use it, so that its general features may be considered as well known. And it might suffice to say that the *Shorter OED* reproduces, in a condensed form, the characteristics of the larger work: pronunciation, etymology, the definitions of the different meanings as well as their semantic classification together with known dates of the first (and, if necessary, the last) written appearance. Moreover we have selected quotations illustrating the historical development of the words.

But the reader may wonder how it has been possible to condense the matter of some 15000 pages of imperial quarto into less than 2500 of demy quarto. If we carefully examine the *Shorter OED* we perceive at once that, with the exception of some which have been used by Chaucer, most words that have not survived the Middle English period have been left out; and very wisely too, for this dictionary is not designed for the specialist but for the general reader. Modern words, technical or scientific, of very rare occurrence, have also been dropped. Then the compilers have omitted the historical data concerning phonetics and morphology. Lastly, derivatives are often entered under the main word instead of being allotted a separate article, as in the *OED*. Although this practice breaks with the strictly alphabetical order it will not put the reader to any serious inconvenience. Such is the cost at which it has been possible to reproduce all the other features of the *OED* by means of condensation. This has been realised by reducing the etymologies to the proportions of the work without sacrificing anything indispensable; by the economy of a few words or a clause in the wording of the definitions, but especially by suppressing a great many of the quotations. Several clever typographical devices have been employed to save space. But the dictionary remains nevertheless very readable and the appearance of the three column page is, from the point of view of printing, a splendid achievement, just as is the larger work.

As was to be expected the *Shorter OED* is not only a reduction of the parent work. There were, in the latter, very few misprints left: they have been, so far as I have been able to see, largely corrected. A first perusal of the volumes has only brought under my notice a Goth. *biquiman* (under *become* v.) which ought of course to read *biqiman* and which has been faithfully but unfortunately repeated from the *OED*. But what makes the *Shorter OED* especially valuable is that it has been brought up-to-date. Materials collected for the forthcoming supplement have been made use of. It has thus been possible to antedate, sometimes by more than a century, the age of certain words and to add the coinage of recent years. Many new words and idioms created since the printing of the *OED* for the letter A began are to be found in this valuable offspring. The extreme limit being the summer of 1932, *yo-yo* is recorded ("a toy resembling the old *bandalore*") but *rumba* is not. And perhaps it is not useless to point out that we have here a fairly complete modern vocabulary in *alphabetical* order: even when the supplement is published this will remain an advantage of the abridgment and, from this point of view as from many others, the latter will always prove useful as an index to the *OED* and its supplement.

Of course it will never replace them. And it has been necessary to make sacrifices even in the modern vocabulary; the reader, according to his taste, will easily detect omissions. For instance, I have not found *cytology* or



wiriness when I looked for them. It seems to me, but this is only a personal impression, that the materials collected for the supplement might have been more largely drawn upon. Working through some pages taken at random (and checking them with the desiderata lists for the Supplement published in the *Periodical*) I have not found among them *spin-bowler* (cricket), to *spraddle*, *squadrilla* (of aeroplanes), *squiffer* (concertina), *squish* (nonsense), a *squit* (of a boy), *stabilization* (of payments, etc.), *stack* (of books in a library), *Stalinism*, *stall seat* (in a theatre). The vocabulary of aircraft and wireless telegraphy might be more complete; words now current, such as *heterodyne*, *superhet(erodyne)*, *square-law* are wanting; *statics* is recorded but it is defined "atmospherics" which is not to be found. On the other hand the reader will find *spread-over* (of hours of work), *squadron* (= air-fleet), *squadron-leader*, *squandermania*. The earliest date given for *pep* "vigour, energy" is 1920. But it seems to me that the word was in use a few years before. The etymologies given are as a rule very accurate and they have been, as I said, reduced to the proportions of the dictionary. When important explanations or discussions would have been too long to reproduce the reader is referred to the *OED*. The only point to which I wish to call attention it that it seems to me that the progress made since the *OED* was printed might have been taken a little more into account. For instance, it has been shown that the etymology of *clown* is Lat. *colōnius* "peasant". And since the study published by Nyrop, it is no longer true to say that the ultimate etymology of *gules* is "uncertain".

But these are minor points; for the permanent value of such a work does not lie in the fact that new-fangled words are embedded in it. Indeed, other dictionaries have been recently published in England as well as in the United States for which it has been claimed that they were very rich in neologisms. What makes of the *Shorter OED* a priceless work is the fact, which no other country can boast of, that we have here, in a handy form, and for a very moderate sum that most students will be able to afford, a complete and trustworthy *historical* treatment of the vocabulary of a great modern language. From Chaucer to Galsworthy all the words coined by great writers are there; all the varieties of English, archaic, obsolete, dialectal, colloquial, colonial, American, scientific, slang, etc... are there (one might perhaps wish that there were less of scientific and more of slang formations) and wherever possible the words are exactly dated, wherever useful, selected quotations are given. For no other language could we find anything approaching the richness and accuracy of the *Shorter OED*; Paul's *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Hatzfeld-Darmesteter-Thomas's *Dictionnaire général* are excellent works to which every student owes a great deal but they cannot compare with the present publication. And it would even be unfair to suggest comparison; for it would not have been possible to produce anything like the *Shorter OED* had not the larger *OED* been in existence. To render possible an historical dictionary of English in 2500 pages, an extensive, and we may even say, unlimited treatment of English vocabulary had first to be realized. The fact that the *Shorter OED* is the abridgment of a larger work cannot be too much stressed, for it has thus been possible to cull the best of the *OED*.

How this has been done by Dr. Little and by his successors let any one judge for himself who will take the trouble to compare at random a page of the *OED* with its reduced form such as we have it here. Repeated

comparisons of this kind have confirmed us in the belief that, all in all, it has been done in a masterly way. The *Shorter OED* is a splendid lexicographical performance. England may be proud of it; and students and lovers of English throughout the world will certainly be grateful.

Paris.

F. MOSSÉ.

By way of a rider to Dr. Mossé's review, a few words may be said on the value, or otherwise, of the *SOED* to the student of American English. "We know that the *Oxford Dictionary* is weak on 'American use' — to quote a contributor to the Vth volume of *American Speech* — and the abridged edition has inherited this weakness. Not that one wishes to complain of the gingerly treatment of American slang — that would have to be recorded in Year Books, not in more or less static works like dictionaries. Nor are we here concerned with the popular delusion that Americanisms, if not actually slang, are at best confined to colloquial speech. There is such a thing as standard American English, just as there is standard European English, and our quarrel with the *SOED* is that the former is inadequately represented.

To give a few examples. *Brief*, in the sense of: abridgment, epitome, is marked obsolete, its latest occurrence being dated 1691. As a matter of fact, this meaning of the word is still current in America, witness a series of handbooks on timely topics published by the Wilson Company, New York, containing 'reprints of selected articles, briefs, bibliographies, debates, study outlines,' where 'briefs' stands for summaries of the pros and cons of any debatable subject. — The phrase *by and large*, a nautical term originally, also fig. 'in one direction and another, all ways,' last quotation (in the *OED*) 1708, marked † in the abridgment, is still very much alive across the Atlantic<sup>1</sup> in the sense of 'roughly speaking,' e.g.: '... such a grouping by and large accurately represents the facts.' (*Middletown*, by R. & H. Lynd, New York & London 1929, p. 23; other examples *ibid.* pp. 22 & 36). — *Lone*, in the sense of 'solitary,' is marked 'chiefly poet. and rhet.'; neither here nor in the *OED* is any mention made of the typically American word-group *lone wolf*, as in: 'I think of the lone-wolf harrying of the capitalist pack which Upton Sinclair has been carrying on since the publication of his "Springtime and Harvest" back in 1901.' (*America as Americans See It*, p. 176); 'He says he's just a lone wolf' (of a workman without friends; *Middletown*, p. 277); 'the lone-wolf worker in Middletown has his flanks somewhat protected, but he follows a precarious trail' (*ibid.*, p. 278). — *Slant* is defined in the *SOED* '3. dial. and U.S. a. A sly hit or sarcasm 1825. b. An opportunity, occasion 1837.', but one looks in vain for the meaning 'sidelight, outlook,' evidenced by: 'You get a real slant on the psychology of Maine humor, in the statement, "He ken knock a haouse daoun!"' It expresses an amused contempt for the "upstart" braggart, ....' (*American Speech*, II, 2, 83), and from a recent prospectus of *American Speech*: 'For the Ad and Editorial Writer — A mine of suggestions, new slants, popular topics to stir discussion.' — *Chain store*, also *chain*, 'one of a group of stores which are centrally administered and centrally merchandized,' with its numerous ramifications: chain (store) system voluntary chain stores, chain management, anti-chain

<sup>1</sup> Is it extinct in British use? I am struck by its employment by another contributor to this number, p. 118. — Z.

store laws, chain and independent grocers, limited price chains, manufacturers' chains, anti-chain publications, chain store stocks, the chain-crazed public, chain advance, etc. etc. — what European reader understands at first sight: 'How a prominent chain picks store locations,' or: 'Independent mortality unaffected by chains'? (for all and sundry see the volume *Chain Stores* in the series published by the Wilson Company just referred to) — is not so much as mentioned.

And so one might go on, almost *ad infinitum*. Of course, we do not mean to imply that American usage is altogether neglected; the number of entries and definitions marked *U.S.* is very large indeed. But any vigilant reader of American English will quickly realize how much more is omitted. Assuredly, if ever publication supplied a 'long-felt want,' such a one will be Professor Craigie's forthcoming *Historical Dictionary of American English*. Meanwhile, students of American English will have to make shift; Dutchmen among them are by no means badly off with Broers-ten Bruggencate's *English-Dutch Dictionary*, where most of the above desiderata are duly registered.

The Hague.

R. W. ZANDVOORT.

### Brief Mention.

*Studies in the Grammar of the Early Printed English Bible Versions.* By AUGUSTA BJÖRLING. pp. 197. Lund: Gleerupska Univ.-Bokhandeln. 1926.

Miss Björling's monograph on the early printed versions of the Bible surveys the language of nine editions (Tindale 1525 and 1534, Coverdale, the Great Bible, Whittingham, Geneva, Bishops', Rheims and Authorized Version) as exemplified in the Psalter and the Gospel of St. Matthew. The study is not comprehensive, but includes for the most part points of grammar and syntax 'which differentiate it [the language] from present-day usage'. The author's further intention has been 'to show which of the earlier versions has influenced the Authorized Version most strongly; and thirdly to determine whether the linguistic usage of these versions is in accordance with that of contemporary works'. It is impossible to give a general idea of the work, since it depends on details, but the book will be useful for reference — it would be more useful if it had an index. There is little or no reference to earlier forms of the language, and certain points are omitted on which one would have welcomed a statement (e.g. the verbal inflexions). There are very brief summaries of the individual characteristics of the versions (pp. 176-8). The author stresses the great influence of the Geneva Bible on the AV., though she admits that the influence is shown in the vocabulary and diction rather than in the linguistic features discussed in the present thesis. She concludes further that the language of Tindale and the grammar of AV. agree with the ordinary usage of their periods. — M.S.S.

### Erratum.

April number, p. 61, ll. 15—13 fr. b., instead of *dæg* etc. read *dæg*.



## Bibliography.

## HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM.

[19th Century and After.]

*The Shakespeare Head Brontë.* Edited by THOMAS JAMES WISE and JOHN ALEXANDER SYMINGTON. *The Brontës: Their Lives, Friendships and Correspondence.* In Four Volumes. 9½ × 6¼. Vol. I. xv. + 310 pp. Vol. II. xi + 350 pp. Vol. III. xi. + 341 pp. Vol. IV. 305 pp. Oxford: Blackwell. £ 3 n. the four volumes.

*The Brontës and other Essays.* By G. F. BRADBY. 7¾ × 5¼, 137 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 5s. n.

*Charlotte Brontë.* By E. F. BENSON. 9 × 5¼, xvii. + 313 pp. Longmans. 12s. 6d. n.

*Naturdarstellung und Naturempfindung bei den Brontës.* Von V. SCHERMBACH. 8º. pp. 123. Phil. Diss. Münster 1931.

*Letters of Mrs. Gaskell and Charles Eliot Norton, 1855—1865.* Edited with an Introduction by JANE WHITEHILL. 9¼ × 6, xxxii. + 131 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 10s. 6d. n.

*The Novel and the Oxford Movement.* By J. E. BAKER. xiii. + 220 pp. Princeton Studies in English, no. 8. Princeton University Press; London, Milford, 1932. 11/— net. [A review will appear.]

*The Life of George Eliot.* By EMILIE and GEORGES ROMIEU. Translated from the French by BRIAN W. DOWNS. 8¼ × 5½, 370 pp. Jonathan Cape. 7s. 6d. n.

*Studies in the Mental Development of George Eliot in Relation to the Science, Philosophy, and Theology of her Day.* By MINORU TOYODA. 8½ × 6, xii. + 266 pp. Tokyo: Kenkyusha Company.

*The Eighteen-Sixties.* Essays by Fellows of the Royal Society of Literature. Edited by JOHN DRINKWATER. 9 × 5¼, x. + 282 pp. Cambridge University Press. 12s. 6d. n.

*Of the Tribe of Homer.* Being an Enquiry into the Theory and Practice of English Narrative Verse since 1833. By WILLEM VAN DOORN. 9¼ × 6¼, 249 pp. N.V. De Arbeiderspers, Amsterdam. 1932. f 4.90. [See Review, Aug. 1932.]

Diss. Amsterdam.

*Die Evolutionsidee bei Tennyson und Browning.* Von A. HEGNER. 8º. 31 pp. Phil. Diss. Freiburg i. Br. 1931.

*Browning and the Twentieth Century.* A Study of Robert Browning's Influence and Reputation. By A. ALLEN BROCKINGTON. viii. + 303 pp. Oxford University Press, 1932. 15/— net. [See Review.]

*The Rossetti Family, 1824-1854.* By R. D. WALLER. 9½ × 6¼, xii. + 324 pp. Manchester: University Press. 1932. 10s. 6d. n. [See Review, Oct. 1932.]

*The Wife of Rossetti.* Her Life and Death. By VIOLET HUNT. 9 × 5¼, xxx. + 339 pp. John Lane. 18s. n.

*Nachwirkungen Dante Gabriel Rossettis.* Von H. KLENK. 61 pp. [A review will appear.]

*Die Sprachform der Lyrik Christina Rossettis.* Von F. DUBSLAFF. (Studien zur englischen Philologie herausg. von L. Morsbach & H. Hecht. lxxvii.) VII. + 94 pp. Halle, Niemeyer, 1933. RM. 4.40. [A review will appear.]

*The Pre-Raphaelite Comedy.* By FRANCIS BICKLEY. 8¼ × 5½, x. + 276 pp. Constable. 10s. n.

*Das italienische Element in Dante Gabriel Rossetti.* Von F. W. BACHSCHMIDT. 8º. 83 pp. Phil. Diss. Münster 1930.

*Newman's Apologia Pro Vita Sua.* The Two Versions of 1864 and 1865. Preceded by Newman's and Kingsley's Pamphlets. With an Introduction by WILFRID WARD. 7¼ × 5¼, xxxi. + 528 pp. Oxford University Press. London: Milford. 7s. 6d. n.

First published in 1913.

*A Study of Walter Pater.* By ARTHUR SYMONS. 8¾ × 7, 112 pp. Charles J. Sawyer. 12s. 6d. n.

*L'idée de l'Art pour l'Art dans la Littérature Anglaise pendant la Période Victorienne.* Par L. ROSENBLATT. (Bibl. de la Revue de Litt. Comp., 70.) 328 pp. Paris, Champion, 1931. [See Review, April 1933.]

*Die englische Gesellschaft im Spiegel der Romane von George Meredith.* Von B. ALBERTS-ARNDT. gr. 8°. 104 pp. Karlsruhe: Braun. 1931. RM. 4.80.

*Das Werden der künstlerischen Weltanschauung George Merediths, dargestellt an seinen ersten Romanen.* Von E. MERTNER. 8°. 121 pp. Phil. Diss. Halle 1930.

*The Life of Lewis Carroll.* By LANGFORD REED. 8¾ × 5¼, 142 pp. W. and G. Foyle. 7s. 6d. n.

*Lewis Carroll.* By WALTER DE LA MARE. 9 × 6. 67 pp. Faber and Faber. 3s. 6d. n.  
Mr. Walter de la Mare's paper on Lewis Carroll, originally published in his essays "The Eighteen-Eighties" in 1930.

*At John Murray's. Records of a Literary Circle, 1843-1892.* By GEORGE PASTON. Preface by the RIGHT HON. LORD ERNLE. 9¼ × 6½, xvi. + 320 pp. John Murray. 15s. n.

*Female Characters in the Works of Anthony Trollope.* By C. C. KOETS. 106 pp. Gouda, T. van Tilburg. 1933.

Diss. Amsterdam.

*Geisterhaftes und Okkultistisches in der engl. Erzählungskunst von 1880 bis 1890.* Von G. WAMELING. 8°. pp. 59. Emsdetten i. W.: Lechte 1931. (Phil. Diss. Münster, 1931.)

*George Gissing und die soziale Frage.* Von A. WEBER. (Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, herausg. von Max Förster. Heft XX.) 298 pp. Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1932. R.M. 15.—. [A review will appear.]

*Die Märchen Oscar Wildes.* Von A. HERZOG. 8°. 109 pp. Phil. Diss. Zurich, 1930.

*Thomas Hardys Naturansicht in seinen Romanen.* Von FRIEDA VOGT. (Britannica, herausg. von Emil Wolff, 3.) 111 pp. Hamburg, Friederichsen, de Gruyter & Co., 1932. RM. 6.—. [A review will appear.]

*Soziale Lyrik in England, 1880-1914.* Von E. WALRAF. (Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, herausg. von Max Förster. Heft XXIV.) 108 pp. Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1932. RM. 5.—. [A review will appear.]

*Main Currents in American Thought.* By VERNON LOUIS PARRINGTON. In Three Volumes. 9 × 5¾. Vol. I. *The Colonial Mind, 1620-1800*, xviii. + 413 pp. Vol. II. *The Romantic Revolution in America, 1800-1860*, xxii. + 493 pp. Vol. III. *The Beginnings of Critical Realism in America, 1860-1920*. Completed to 1900 only. xxxix. + 429 pp. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co. \$ 4 each.

*England im Urteil der amerikanischen Literatur vor dem Bürgerkrieg.* Von K. H. PFEFFER. gr. 8°. 178 pp. Leipzig: Mayer & Müller, 1931. = Palaestra 177. RM. 11.80.

*Classic Americans.* A Study of Eminent American Writers from Irving to Whitman, with an Introductory Survey of the Colonial Background of our National Literature by HENRY SEIDEL CANBY. 8¾ × 6, xvii. + 371 pp. New York: Harcourt, Brace. London: Milford. 12s. 6d. n.

*The Orient in American Transcendentalism.* A Study of Emerson, Thoreau, and Alcott. By A. CHRISTY. XIX + 382 pp. New York, Columbia University Press; London. Milford, 1932. 26/6 net. [A review will appear.]

*The Making of American Literature.* By THOMAS H. DICKINSON. Being a Near View of the Procession of American Writings and Writing Men from the Earliest Settlements up to our own Times. With some consideration of the Way Men and Women Lived; their Vocations, Opinions, and Amusements. 6¾ × 5, 731 pp. Appleton. 12s. 6d. n.

*Die englische Literatur der Vereinigten Staaten von Nord-Amerika.* Von W. FISCHER. Wildpark-Potsdam: Athenaion. 4°. 133 pp. m. Abb. u. 3 Taf. = Handbuch d. Literaturwissenschaft. RM. 10.80; geb. 14.30. [A review will appear.]

*Mark Twain.* By STEPHEN LEACOCK. 7¼ × 5¼, 167 pp. Peter Davies. 5s. n.

*Die amerikanische Literatur der Gegenwart.* Von R. MICHAUD. (Aus d. Franz. übers. von K. ILLCH.) 8°. 256 pp. Leipzig: Dioskuren-Verl. 1931. = Welt u. Geist. RM. 8.—.

*Die literarische Entwicklung von John Dos Passos.* Von W. NEUSE. gr. 8°. 109 pp. Phil. Diss. Giessen, 1930.

*Creative Criticism and other Essays.* By J. E. SPINGARN. (New and enlarged Edition.) 7½ × 5, x. + 221 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 10s. n.

*American Literature as an Expression of the National Mind.* By R. BLANKENSHIP. xviii. + 731 pp. New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1931. \$ 4.—.

*Dawn. A History of Myself.* By THEODORE DREISER. 8¼ × 5¼, 620 pp. Constable. 10s. n.

*Imagism and the Imagists. A Study in Modern Poetry.* By GLENN HUGHES.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ , xiii. + 283 pp. California: Stanford University Press. London: Milford. 18s. n.

*English Literary Periodicals.* By WALTER GRAHAM.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , 424 pp. New York: Thomas Nelson. \$ 7.50.

*Die Politische Schulung des Englischen Volkes.* Von H. SCHÖFFLER. (Hefte zur Englandkunde, 5.) Pp. 38. Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1931. RM. 1.25.

*A Survey of Burlesque and Parody in English.* By GEORGE KITCHIN.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , xxiii. + 387 pp. Oliver and Boyd. 16s. n.

*Fashion in Literature. A Study of Changing Taste.* By E. E. KELLETT.  $9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , 369 pp. Routledge, 12s. 6d. n.

*Some Religious Elements in English Literature.* By ROSE MACAULAY.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ , 160 pp. (Hogarth Lectures, No. 14). Hogarth Press. 3s. 6d. n.

*Landscape in English Art and Poetry.* By LAURENCE BINYON.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , xii. + 295 pp. Cobden-Sanderson. 7s. 6d. n.

*Countries of the Mind. Essays in Literary Criticism.* By JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY. First Series. New Edition, Revised and Enlarged. vii. + 192 pp. Second Series. 206 pp.  $8 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ . Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 7s. 6d. n. each.

*Music at Night, and Other Essays.* By ALDOUS HUXLEY.  $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 269 pp. Chatto and Windus. 7s. 6d. n. [See article, Oct. 1931.]

*Personality in Literature, 1913—1931.* By R. A. SCOTT-JAMES.  $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , 231 pp. Martin Secker. 7s. 6d. n.

*Norman Douglas.* By H. M. TOMLINSON.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ , 63 pp. (The Dolphin Books.) Chatto and Windus. 2s. n.

*The London Book of English Prose.* Selected and Ordered by HERBERT READ and BONAMY DOBRÉE.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ . xxxviii. + 665 pp. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 7s. 6d. n.

*The Devil in Legend and Literature.* By M. RUDWIN. xi. + 354 pp. Chicago, Open Court Publishing Co., 1931. Price \$ 3.00. [See Review, April 1932.]

*Essays by Divers Hands.* Being the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom. New Series, Vol. X. Edited by SIR FRANCIS YOUNGHUSBAND.  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ . viii. + 140 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 7s. n.

*Collected Essays, Papers, &c., of Robert Bridges.* VIII., Dante in English Literature. IX., The Poems of Emily Brontë. X., Dryden on Milton.  $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , xiv. + pp. 245—282. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 2s. 6d. n.

*Der Engländer im Spiegel der Französischen Literatur von der Romantik bis zum Weltkrieg.* Von H. JAECKEL. gr. 8°. pp. 249. Breslau: Priebatsch 1932. = Sprache und Kultur der germ.-rom. Völker. C. Bd 9. RM. 10.—.

*Die Auffassung und Gestaltung des Napoleonproblems in engl. Drama.* Von K. LEHMANN. 8°. 119 pp. Phil. Diss. Erlangen 1931.

*Letters to my Daughter.* Memories of John Millington Synge. By REV. SAMUEL SYNGE.  $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 287 pp. Dublin: The Talbot Press, Ltd. 5s. n.

*La Littérature Anglaise.* Par PAUL DOTTIN. 223 pp. Paris, Armand Colin, 1931. 10 fr. 50.

*Neue Wertungen im englischen Roman.* Problemgeschichte des englischen Romans im zwanzigsten Jahrhundert. Von I. MARINOFF. 142 pp. Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1932: RM. 8.—. [A review will appear.]

*The Letters of D. H. Lawrence.* Edited, and with an Introduction, by ALDOUS HUXLEY.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , xxxiv. + 889 pp. Heinemann. 21s. n.

*The Savage Pilgrimage.* A Narrative of D. H. LAWRENCE. By CATHERINE CARSWELL.  $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , xiii. + 296 pp. Chatto and Windus. 7s. 6d. n.

*Der Pessimismus bei D. H. Lawrence.* Von W. WESSLAU. 8°. pp. 355. Greifswald: Adler 1931. (Phil. Diss. Greifswald.)

*Die Psychoanalyse im modernen englischen Roman.* Von F. L. SACK. gr. 8°. 104 pp. Phil. Diss. Zurich, 1930.

*The Journals of Arnold Bennett.* Edited by NEWMAN FLOWER. Vol. II, 1911—1921.  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 6$ , 321 pp. Vol. III, 1921—1928. 311 pp. Cassell. 10s. 6d. n. each.

*Virginia Woolf.* By WINIFRED HOLTBY.  $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 206 pp. Wishart. 6s. n.



**Revaluations. Studies in Biography.** By LASCELLES ABERCROMBIE, LORD DAVID CECIL, G. K. CHESTERTON, G. D. H. COLE, STEPHEN GWYNN, JAMES LAVER, CAPTAIN LIDDELL HART, EDWARD MARJORIBANKS, NAOMI MITCHISON, T. EARLE WELBY.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , xi. + 246 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 7s. 6d. n.

**The English Dramatic Critics.** An Anthology, 1660-1932. Assembled by JAMES AGATE.  $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , xii. + 370 pp. Arthur Barker. 12s. 6d. n.

**The English Poetic Mind.** By CHARLES WILLIAMS.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ , viii. + 214 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 7s. 6d. n.

**Essays and Studies.** By Members of the English Association. Vol. XVII. Collected by W. H. HADOW.  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , 105 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 7s. 6d. n. [A review will appear.]

**The Oxford Companion to English Literature.** Compiled and Edited by SIR PAUL HARVEY.  $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , viii. + 866 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 15s. n. [A review will appear.]

## PERIODICALS.

**Publications of the Modern Language Association of America.** XLVII, 2. June 1932. H. B. Hinkley, Science and folk-lore in *The Owl and the Nightingale*. — A. Buchanan, The Irish framework of *Gawain and the Green Knight*. — H. Eagleson, Costume in the Middle English metrical romances. — C. O. Chapman, The authorship of the *Pearl*. — O. Cargill, The date of the A-text of *Piers Ploughman*. — R. D. Cornelius, *Piers Plowman* and the *Roman De Fauvel*. — H. W. Troyer, Who is *Piers Plowman*? — A. K. Getty, The mediæval-modern conflict in Chaucer's poetry. — M. P. Hamilton, Notes on Chaucer and the Rhetoricians. — F. E. Teager, Chaucer's Eagle and the rhetorical colors. — J. A. Work, Echoes of the anathema in Chaucer. — J. B. Severs, Chaucer's source MSS. for the *Clerkes Tale*. — T. H. McNeal, The *Clerk's Tale* as a possible source for *Pandosto*. — A. C. Baugh, Kirk's life records of Thomas Chaucer. — P. H. Nichols, Lydgate's influence on the aureate terms of the Scottish Chaucerians. — P. Hogrefe, Sir Thomas More's connection with the Roper family. — J. Whaler, Animal simile in *Paradise Lost*. — A. Wright, *The Charliad*, an unpublished mock-epic by Joseph Spence. — N. P. Stallknecht, The moral of the *Ancient Mariner*. — B. Weaver, Shelley works out the rhythm of *A Lament*. — E. von Erhardt-Siebold, Harmony of the senses in English, German, and French romanticism. — F. H. Wilkens, Eduard Sievers: November 25, 1850—March 30, 1932. — Id. XLVII, 3. Sept. 1932. F. Collins, Jr., Music in the craft cycles. — M. G. Frampton, Gilbert Pilkington once more. — A. J. Mill, Representations of Lyndsay's *Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*. — R. Hudson, Greene's *James IV* and contemporary allusions to Scotland. — F. L. Jones, Another source for *The Trial of Chivalry*. — K. W. Cameron, *Othello*, Quarto I, reconsidered. — N. S. Bushnell, Natural supernaturalism in *The Tempest*. — E. E. Stoll, *The Tempest*. — F. L. Jones, An experiment with Massinger's verse. — E. N. Backus, The MS. play, *Anna Bullen*. — W. Charvat, Thomas Bancroft. — C. W. Cooper, The triple-portrait of John Lacy. — D. M. McKeithan, The occasion of MacFlecknoe. — R. Blanchard, A prologue and an epilogue for Nicholas Rowe's *Tamermene* by Richard Steele. — L. P. Curtis, The first printer of *Tristram Shandy*. — E. J. Simmons, Catherine the Great and Shakespeare. — P. P. Kies, Lessing's relation to early English sentimental comedy. — E. G. Sutcliffe, Plotting in Reade's novels. — W. D. Templeman, Thoreau, moralist of the picturesque. — The Period Dictionary. — Id. XLVII, 4. Dec. 1932. V. P. Helming, Edward Gibbon and George Deyverdun, collaborators in the *Mémoires Littéraires de la Grande Bretagne*. — F. Baldensperger, Toujours le voyage de Chateaubriand aux Etats-Unis: entre Baltimore et New York. — C. R. Decker, Balzac's literary reputation in Victorian society. — Id. XLVII. Supplement. 1932. American Bibliography for 1932.

**Modern Language Notes.** XLVI, 7. Nov. 1931. K. Malone, Some linguistic studies of 1930 and 1931. — C. O. Chapman, 'Beowulf' and 'Appollonius of Tyre'. — C. P. Lyons, A note on 'Beowulf' 760. — J. D. A. Ogilvy, Alcuin's use of alliteration. — E. Shanks, Examples of the legal usage of 'fine,' sb., in 13th century Anglo-Norman. — E. E. Slaughter, "Every vertu at his reste." — K. Garvin, Note on the tournament in the 'Knights Tale.' — H. L. Savage, A note on 'Sir Gawain and the

Green Knight' 700—2. — W. P. Jones, A source for Henryson's 'Robene and Makyne.' — A. P. Coleman, Polonisms in the English of Conrad's 'Chance.' — E. E. Leisy, "Oh, bury me not." — K. Malone, On the pronunciation of 'mourn'. — *Id.* XLVI, 8. Dec. 1931. K. Malone, Edwin Greenlaw, 1874—1931. — R. Heffner, Spenser's acquisition of Kilcolman. — E. A. Strathmann, Spenser's 'Legends' and 'Court of Cupid.' — C. G. Osgood, Comments on the moral allegory of the 'Faerie Queene.' — C. L. Day, Three notes on Randolph. — J. J. Parry and S. A. Tannenbaum, Further comment on Randolph's text. — S. A. Tannenbaum, A crux in 'Much Ado' and its solution. — B. D. Simison, A source for the first Quarto of 'Henry V.' — A. Warren, Pope's index to Beaumont and Fletcher. — D. Lovett, Campion, variant-readings. — D. Macmillan, The text of 'Love's Last Shift.' — E. T. Norris, The original of Ravenscroft's 'Anatomist,' and an anecdote of Jemmy Spiller. — *Id.* XLVII, 1. Jan. 1932. C. J. Hill, The first English translation of 'Werther.' — J. C. Blankenagel, 'The London Times' account of Heinrich von Kleist's death. — H. Spencer, Marlowe's rice "with a powder." — *Id.* XLVII, 2. Febr. 1932. N. F. Adkins, James Fenimore Cooper and the Bread and Cheese Club. — L. Howard, For a critique of Whitman's transcendentalism. — L. Cooper, Mark Twain's lilacs and laburnums. — T. O. Mabbott, More American references to Blake before 1863. — E. L. Griggs, Coleridge, De Quincey, and nineteenth-century editing. — M. H. Addington, Wordsworth and Henry Headley. — H. Buck, A new Smollett anecdote. — L. M. Knapp, Smollett and Le Sage's 'The Devil upon Crutches.' — J. M. Purcell, A note on Smollett's language. — K. M. Lynch, 'Pamela Nubile,' 'L'Écossaise,' and 'The English Merchant.' — C. M. Webster, The Puritan's ears in 'A Tale of a Tub.' — J. A. Wolf, A note on Dryden's Zimri. — A. H. Miller, Chaucer's "Secte Saturnyn." — M. H. Addington, "Ah! What avails." — E. Bernbaum, Recent works on prose fiction before 1800 (notices Proper, Social Elements in English Prose Fiction between 1700—1832.) — R. D. H(avens) notices Bosker, Literary Criticism in the Age of Johnson. — *Id.* XLVII, 3. March 1932. S. A. Tannenbaum, A Tourneur mystification. — T. Brooke, Elizabethan proof corrections. — C. M. Newlin, Some sources of Richard Edward's 'Damon and Pithias.' — G. W. Whiting, The date of the second edition of 'The Constant Couple.' — H. T. Silverstein, Chaucer's 'Brutus Cassius.' — S. Sakanishi, A note on the Nonne Preestes Tale. — C. M. Webster, Omissions from 'Swift en France.' — F. W. Emerson, Why Milton uses "Cambuscan" and "Camball." — *Id.* XLVII, 4. April 1932. W. S. Clark, Lost stage directions in Orrery's plays. — H. M. Jones, Wycherley, Montaigne, Tertullian, and Mr. Summers. — C. M. Webster, 'Hudibras' and Swift. — C. E. Ward, Was John Dryden Collector of Customs? — E. B. Dike, The 'NED': additions and corrections. — A. N. Wiley, The English vogue of prologues and epilogues. — J. A. Work, Chaucer's sermon and Retractions. — C. M. Webster, Chaucer's Turkish bows. — W. A. Eddy reviews C. van Doorn, An investigation into the Character of Jonathan Swift. — *Id.* XLVII, 5. May 1932. W. L. Phelps, Notes on Browning's 'Pauline.' — A. D. Snyder, Coleridge's "Theory of Life." — A. B. Ballman, On the revisions of 'Hyperion.' — E. C. Averill, The authenticity of Burns' "When first I saw fair Jeanie's face." — S. A. Larrabee, An interpretation of Blake's 'A Divine Image.' — A. E. Dubois, Additions to the bibliography of W. S. Gilbert's contributions to magazines. — T. A. Zunder, Walt Whitman and Nathaniel Hawthorne. — J. H. Birss, Whitman on Arnold: an uncollected comment. — P. B. Anderson, Addison's 'Letter from Italy.' — G. McColley, The theory of a plurality of worlds as a factor in Milton's attitude toward the Copernican hypothesis. — *Id.* XLVII, 6. June, 1932. R. Krauss, Notes on Thomas, Geoffrey and Philippa Chaucer. — C. Camden, Jr., Chauceriana. — F. Collins, Jr., 'Solus' in the Miller's Tale. — G. P. Faust, Two notes on Chaucer. — K. Malone, Two notes on 'Widsith.' — E. Shanks, The influence of legal research in broadening English vocabulary. — A. S. C. Ross, Old-English 'gebidaþ.' — P. F. Jones, Aldhelm and the comitatus-ideal. — F. T. Bowers, The stabbing of a portrait in Elizabethan tragedy. — J. M. Purcell, A few notes on Sidney's 'Lady of May.' — R. A. Law, Some Shakespeare studies of 1930 and 1931. — *Id.* XLVII, 7. Nov. 1932. A. O. Lovejoy, The first Gothic revival and the return to nature. — W. D. Templeman, Sir Joshua Reynolds on the picturesque. — F. M. Darnall, Swift's belief in immortality. — C. M. Webster, Notes on the Yahoos. — H. E. Bagley, A checklist of the poems of Charles Sackville, sixth earl of Dorset and Middlesex.

# The Place of *Never* and *Ever* in Present-day English Prose.

## Previous work.

As far as we are aware, four grammarians only have devoted special attention to this question: three of them, Sweet, Kruisinga and Poutsma, in their grammars; the fourth, Fijn van Draat, in an important article in *Neophilologus* VI, pp. 56—88.

Sweet and Kruisinga<sup>1</sup> can be said to agree; only, Kruisinga, though much less categorical, goes a step further in giving a phonetic translation of the rules formulated by Sweet. Poutsma enters into more details, but is not always right.

Fijn van Draat goes still further than Kruisinga: according to him, any adverb, and particularly *never* and *ever*, is always placed so as to obtain some rhythmic formula or other.<sup>2</sup> But it is easy to find sentences that do not contain his formulae: the fundamental errors of Fijn van Draat are to scan prose like verse and to pay no attention to the frequency of the different constructions. He is wrong when, speaking of *never* and *ever*, he writes, p. 70: "When the verb is in a compound tense, there is just as with *sometimes* the greatest freedom in the place of the adverb. Now it precedes all the auxiliaries, now stands between them, now again follows all the verb-forms. Even the position between verb and object is not excluded." But in the examples that follow he does not quote a single one of the adverb following all the verb-forms or placed between verb and object. The fact is that there is no great freedom. Sentence-stress does not explain the placing of *never* and *ever*.

Even if we sum up all the positive data or rules given by these four grammarians, we do not arrive at completeness. There is much left to be said, even on important points; and there are curious irregularities to be mentioned, which help to determine the range of the rules.

## Our method.

We have limited our study to *never* and *ever* because these are not quite treated like the other adverbs of indefinite time. This limitation is compensated by an increase in precision.

We have gathered and classified about 5000 sentences<sup>3</sup> from modern prose-writers; some also from Sweet's *Primer of Spoken English*, from Armstrong and Ward's *Handbook of English Intonation*, and from Jones' *Outline of*

---

<sup>1</sup> Kruisinga treats of *never* and *ever* together with the other adverbs of indefinite time; as the latter do not obey quite the same rules, Kruisinga at first sight seems not to agree completely with Sweet.

<sup>2</sup> In his formulae Fijn van Draat generally includes the syllable preceding *never* or *ever*; why does not he do so always? Moreover, he forgets that a given sentence can be stressed in different ways according to the relative importance of its elements, and that, particularly, *never* and *ever* are not always stressed.

<sup>3</sup> In all quotations the italics or stress marks are those of the author quoted.



*English Phonetics*, 3rd edition, with the stressing given by their respective authors.<sup>1</sup>

These statistics have been studied phonetically, semantically and even stylistically; they have enabled us, not only to state what places can be given to the adverbs *never* and *ever*, but also to characterize each construction and to indicate — approximately of course — how often it occurs. The rules we have found in so doing have, moreover, been traced back to a few general principles (see p. 148) concerning the negation and the emphatic stress.

The works we have drawn our examples from are the following :

- I. G. B. SHAW: *Love among the artists*, Constable.
- II. " *Cashel Byron's Profession*, Constable 1924.
- III. " *Unpleasant Plays*, Tauchnitz.
- IV. " *Pleasant Plays*, Tauchnitz.
- V. " *Androcles and Pygmalion*, Tauchnitz.
- VI. " *Fanny's First Play*, Tauchnitz.
- VII. " *Heartbreak House*, Tauchnitz.
- VIII. " *Back to Methuselah*, Tauchnitz.
- IX. " *Saint Joan*, Tauchnitz.
- X. J. GALSWORTHY: *The Country House*, Heinemann 1921.
- XI. " *The Man of Property*, Heinemann 1921.
- XII. " *Five Tales*, Heinemann, 1921.
- XIII. " *In Chancery*, Heinemann 1921.
- XIV. " *To Let*, Heinemann, 1921.
- XV. " *The Island Pharisees*, Tauchnitz.
- XVI. " *The Patrician*, Tauchnitz.
- XVII. G. K. CHESTERTON: *The Man who was Thursday*, Tauchnitz.
- XVIII. " *Tales of the Long Bow*, id.
- XIX. " *Flying Inn*, id.
- XX. " *Innocence of Father Brown*, id.
- XXI. " *Our Note-book*, in the *Illustrated London News* (reference to date of the number).
- XXII. H. G. WELLS: *Mr. Blettsworthy on Rampole Island*, Benn 1928.
- XXIII. " *Tono Bungay*, Macmillan 1911.
- XXIV. " *The stolen Bacillus*, Tauchnitz.
- XXV. " *Tales of Space and Time*, id.
- XXVI. " *When the Sleeper wakes*, id.
- XXVII. " *Love and Mr. Lewisham*, id.
- XXVIII. " *The Plattner Story and others*, id.
- XXIX. " *The Sea Lady*, id.
- XXX-XXXI. " *Kipps*, Tauchnitz, 2 volumes.
- XXXII. A. BENNETT: *The Matador of the Five Towns*, Tauchnitz.
- XXXIII-IV. " *The Old Wives' Tale*, id. 2 volumes.
- XXXV-VI. " *Clayhanger*, id. 2 volumes.
- XXXVII. " *Hilda Lessways*, id.
- XXXVIII. O. WILDE: *The Happy Prince and other Stories*, Duckworth, 1920.
- XXXIX. " *The Importance of being Earnest*, Tauchnitz.
- XL. " *The Picture of Dorian Gray*, id.
- XLI-XLII. D. H. LAWRENCE: *Sons and Lovers*, Tauchnitz, 2 volumes.
- XLIII. " *The man who died*, Tauchnitz.
- XLIV. " *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, Odyssey Press 1933.
- XLV. G. MOORE: *Confessions of a young man*, Tauchnitz.
- XLVI-VII. " *Evelyn Innes*, id. 2 volumes.
- XLVIII. " *Memoirs of my dead life*, id.
- IL. LORD DUNSANY: *The Blessing of Pan*, Putnam's Sons 1927.
- L-LI. A. HUXLEY: *Point Counter Point*, Tauchnitz, 2 volumes.
- LII. J. BARRIE: *Margaret Ogilvy*, Tauchnitz.
- LIII. TH. HARDY: *Far from the madding crowd*, Macmillan 1927.

<sup>1</sup> As stress plays such a part in this question, some gramophone records have been examined, but without any great profit: they contain many examples of the normal place of *never* and *ever*, but hardly any of the other possibilities. Thousands of records would have to be bought in order to gather sufficient evidence.

These works will be referred to by means of the roman figure given here, followed by the number of the page, except for XXI.

The facts themselves have brought us to classify our examples as follows :

I. Sentences or clauses in which the adverb accompanies a finite verb: A. In the declarative form; B. In the interrogative form; C. In the imperative form.

II. Clauses or phrases in which the adverb accompanies an infinitive, participle or gerund.

We have not taken into consideration:

1. Incomplete sentences or clauses, e.g.:

(1) Well, I never! (VI 37)

(2) Would you ever! (XLIV 116)

(3) She seldom looked at the paper, never at the births, marriages and deaths. (XIV 249)

2. sentences in which *never* bears upon a noun: the place of the adverb is determined by that of the noun; e.g.:

(4) But he said never a word. (IL 124)

(5) Round, sound oaths were heard where never oaths had been heard before. (XXXV 181)

3. sentences containing: *ever* in the sense of *always*; or the phrase *ever so much*. The rules are not the same.

4. sentences in which *never* is not used adverbially:

(6) It is now or never. (XVII 218)

(7) I never *have* told a lie... I say never. (VI 243)

## The adverb accompanies a finite verb in the declarative form.

### I. Normal place.

Two cases are to be considered: A. the finite verb is not a form of *have* (auxiliary of perfect tenses), *be*, *shall*, *will*, *may*, *can*, *must*, *ought* or *need*; B. the finite verb is a form of one of these verbs.

#### A. The verb is not a form of *have*, *be*, etc.

*Never* in 99 % of these sentences, *ever* in 93 %, are placed between subject and verb, whatever be the stress of the adverb, whatever be the kind of verb, the number of its syllables or the place of its stress<sup>1</sup>:

(11) I never thought this would happen. (X 121)

(12) If you ever get married, which seems to me extremely problematic, you will be very glad to know Bunbury. (XXXIX 40)

(13) I *never* apologize. (IV 95)

(14) For nobody ever faces unpleasant truths of this kind until the possibility of a way out dawns on them. (V 268)

<sup>1</sup> Three sentences with their stress indicated respectively by Armstrong and Ward, and by Jones, will suffice to show that Fijn van Draat's theory does not always meet the facts. (The third contains an emphatic subject and unstressed *never*).

(8) I 'sat 'next her; and I 'never said a 'single 'thing to her the 'whole 'time. (Armstrong-Ward, 76)

(9) I 'never ask questions about your "private affairs. (id. 66)

(10) 'I never gave you that 'book. (Jones § 962)

With a form of *have*, *dare*, or emphatic *do* :

- (15) "Land's an awful bore in these days, don't you think?" — "We never have it in my family." (XIV 107)
- (16) Olive One is certainly the worst getter-up that I ever had anything to do with. (XXXII 70)
- (17) I suppose most people would call me a failure and all my people failures now; except those who would say we never failed, because we never had to try. (XVIII 68)
- (18) But he's no better than the worst I ever had to do with. (III 68)
- (19) Cashel threatened to break every bone in his skin if he ever dared present himself again before Lydia. (II 336)
- (20) She never dared to repeat her offer. (L 246)
- (21) He scarcely expected his father to say "yes", as his father never did say "yes". (XXXIII 229)
- (22) After June was married, if she ever did marry this fellow, as he supposed she would, he would let it and go into rooms. (IX 29)

Adjuncts of any sort can be placed immediately before or after the adverb:

- (23) He has a musical talent of a certain kind, and is undoubtedly qualified to teach the rudiments of music, though he never, whilst under our guidance, gave any serious consideration to the higher forms of composition. (I 19)
- (24) He might say he didn't know what things were coming to, but he never in his heart believed they were. (XIV 162)
- (25) Assuredly Edwin never even faintly suspected it. (XXXV 47)
- (26) I not only never identified peg-top trousers with Victorianism; I also never identified Victorianism with virtue. (XXI 15.8.1931)
- (27) I hardly ever look at those cases in the paper. (X 73)

B. The verb is a form of *have* (auxiliary), *be*, *shall*, *will*, *may* etc.

It is to be observed that *have to* (followed by an infinitive), *dare* and emphatic *do* are not included in this list: see 17—22.

In 91 % of these sentences, the adverb is placed immediately after the finite verb, no matter how many verbals follow.<sup>1</sup>

- (29) I have never been so happy. (XL 100)
- (30) No anarchist before him had ever approached this conception of his. (XXIV 19)
- (31) I am never deceived in such matters. (XXXIX 171)
- (32) No document concerning a living person of any consequence is ever published in England unless its contents are wholly complimentary. (II 24)
- (33) Mr. Baines was never to be left alone under any circumstances. (XXXIII 36)
- (34) That man is the most utterly unhappy man that was ever human. (XVII 167)
- (35) Wilfred Bohun did not smile, for humour was never his strong point. (XX 224)
- (36) Between us there was never any intention of marriage nor intimacy of soul. (XXIII 198)
- (37) I don't think there was ever anything so cruel. (II 287)
- (38) A man of his distinction should never have been allowed to soil his mind with work. (XI 44)
- (39) Indeed, no woman should ever be quite accurate about her age. (XXXIX 221)
- (40) But I am afraid I shall never have such beautiful ideas as you have. (XXXVIII 93)
- (41) I wonder if I shall ever meet anyone with the sense not to ask that. (XXXVIII 42)
- (42) The pilgrimage must interest him, or he would never have been a pilgrim. (XXI 28.2.1931)
- (43) Nobody will ever believe them. (XIV 67)

<sup>1</sup> The following example from Armstrong-Ward (p. 60) does not contain Fijn van Draat's formula:

(28) You'll "never be able to keep it 'up.



- (44) I was afraid of her, because she was very particular about my manners and appearance, and would never let me go near a theatre. (II 207)
- (45) But there is a workable meaning of the word, which I take to be this: some image evoked by the individual imagination which might never have been evoked by any other imagination, and adds something to the imagery of the world. (XXI 11.4.1931)
- (46) I may not ever be able to write a decent book; but I at least can persevere in the study of Art and Literature. (I 298)
- (47) We must be very serious and circumspect in the house. There must never be the slightest — —. (XXXVII 290)
- (48) "If we were engaged, and you found out you loved somebody better, I might go cracked, but I shouldn't grudge it you." — "I should. You mustn't ever do that with me." (XIV 148)
- (49) The Christ of Matthew could never have become what is vulgarly called a woman's hero. (V 38)
- (50) The only way a woman can ever reform a man is by boring him so completely that he loses all possible interest in life. (XL 130)
- (51) Only the other day a member of the committee said I ought never to have been elected. (III 136)
- (52) Dayson had told her that she ought never to neglect the chance of reading any newspaper whatever. (XXXVII 112)
- (53) It was suddenly clear to him that he needed never trouble to get up punctually at seven again. (XXX 191)
- (54) I call it Creative by three real and even practical tests: first, that nobody need ever have thought of such a thing if Mr. William Shakespeare had not happened to think of it. (XXI 11.4.1931)

We have about 3000 sentences of this sort, and only 2 in which the adverb is placed after the second verbal element:

- (55) Engaged at Miss Chetwynd's, she might easily have never set eyes on Gerald Scales again. (XXXIII 110)

The cause of this shifting is evidently the presence of *easily*, which otherwise would modify *never*; other adjuncts have no such influence: see below. But there is no reason for shifting *ever* in the following sentence:

- (56) No one but you would have ever thought of converting satin shoes into match boxes. (XLV 138)

But, as we shall see with 160, 182—4, colloquial English admits of some liberties — very rarely, in fact — with accepted rules.

All sorts of adjuncts — except *easily*, of course — can immediately precede or follow the adverb:

- (57) She would probably never be allowed to know the entrancing pleasure of a single moment's solitude. (XXXIX 55)
- (58) Queer how one can think of saying to a man things one could never possibly say to him. (XXII 65)
- (59) He had never, therefore, been inoculated against the germs of love by small doses of the poison. (XIV 38)
- (60) He wondered whether he had ever in reality known her, ... (XXXVI 270)
- (61) No woman, however cruel, would ever knowingly be so cruel as she had been. (XXXVI 22)
- (62) For neither of them has ever, in the ordinary sense, been put into practice. (XXI 16.5.1931)
- (63) A thing that has hardly ever happened to me before. (V 231)

Poutsma says that *never* meaning *not at all* precedes the finite verb. That the meaning of this adverb has no influence on its place, is shown by the next sentence:

- (64) "It is the Sleeper. Verily it is the Sleeper," shouted voices. "That is never the Sleeper," shouted others. (XXVI 47).

## II. Less frequent places.

### A. Before one of the verbs of I, B.

This construction occurs in about 7 % of the sentences containing such a verb. We shall discuss this point at length as the grammarians do not agree.

Sweet (§ 1846) gives the following rule: "If these verbs (i. e. auxiliaries and *is*) are emphatic..., the adverb precedes them: (65) He never *is* ready in time! (66) I never have spoken to him, and hope I never shall." Kruisinga (§ 2221, 5th ed.) is not so categorical: "They (the adv. of indefinite time) can precede any strong-stressed auxiliary or copula;" as for the examples, we are not informed whether the auxiliary is strong-stressed or not. Poutsma gives quite another rule (§ 57): "When emphatic, they (i. e. the adverbs) often precede the finite verb: (67) he never was, never will be, half as happy as me." Unfortunately this example is misinterpreted: the emphasis does not fall on *never*, but on *was* and *will*; this example, like 66, is an instance of an emphasized finite verb. In the same paragraph Poutsma gives as an exception what is, in fact, an example of the rule concerning emphatic *never*: (68) "He shall *never* know of it, I tell you; he can *never* know of it."

This rule is that when *never*<sup>1</sup> is italicized, i.e. emphasized, it mostly stands after the finite verb; we have 9 examples, and only one exception (100):

(69) It would *never* do. (XXVII 64)

(70) I am *never* sorry. (IV 90)

But whenever the *finite verb* is emphasized, *never* and *ever* precede<sup>2</sup>:

(71) You'd "always "mean to 'go, but you 'never "would go. (Armstr. 85)

(72) The 'one and 'only de'mand 'poor 'wearied hu'manity has 'ever 'made, or ever "will<sup>3</sup> make, of the story-teller, ... (id. 79)

(76) Any change, or rather the thought of a change — for there *never was* any — always upset her very much. (XIII 307)

(77) "All rot — 'Sesame and Lilies,'" interrupted Dunkerley. "Read bits. Couldn't stand it. *Never can* stand Ruskin." (XXVII 140)

When emphatic *do* is used (see 21, 22, 125), the adverb always precedes:

(78) Nothing happened, except, of course, the usual poverty and crime and drink that we are used to. *Nothing ever* does happen. (VII 187)

Therefore we consider Sweet's as an absolute rule: *never* and *ever* precede the finite verb when it is stressed. This construction (not the stressing of the verb) is logical in the case of *never*: if this negative adverb came after the emphatic verb, the hearer would at first believe the sentence to be an affirmative one. Analogy explains the same construction with *ever*.

<sup>1</sup> We have not any example of italicized *ever*.

<sup>2</sup> In his summary (8), Fijn van Draat wrote: "meeting of stresses makes for emphasis." But here it is just the contrary: though the verb is emphasized, the adverb is placed so as to avoid the "meeting of stresses."

<sup>3</sup> As is further shown by 66 and 67, a strong-stressed finite verb is not always italicized. These three sentences are examples of what Sweet calls modifying stress (§ 1891). It is only found in coordinate clauses: (73) "a kitchen without the slightest indication that it ever had been or ever would be used for preparing human nature's daily food". (XXXVII 7). In a subordinate clause, the verb is not stressed and the adverb follows: (74) "But now he wanted for it things he had never wanted". (XII 144); (75) "At this time, Jack was richer than he had ever been before." (I 175)

Apparent exceptions to our rule are the sentences in which *never* is split up into *not ever*, and the negation added to the finite verb: the latter is strong-stressed (cf. Jones, *Outline* §988) and yet *ever* follows. But it is to be kept in mind that *ever* cannot precede the negative element (cf. Jespersen, *Negation in English and other languages*, p. 58), e.g.:

- (79) Oh, if I had him here, I'd cram him with chocolate creams till he couldn't ever speak again! (IV 67)  
 (80) Then you *can't* ever really want me! (XLIV 258)

All the imperatives with *don't ever* might be quoted here (see p. 146).

Besides these apparent exceptions we have found a real one; but it is so peculiar that it cannot weaken the validity of a rule attested by numerous examples:

- (81) Mrs. Pendyce, on whom those words "I know — I know!" had a strange, emotionalizing effect, as though no one had ever known before, went away with quivering lips. In her life, no one *had* ever "known". (X 246)

Two words are given prominence here: *had* and *known*. If they had not been separated by *ever* their respective stresses would have been prejudicial to one another. Thereby it is not so essential for *ever*, as for *never*, to precede the emphatic auxiliary: it is not a negative element. — It would be difficult to find such another example.

A particular point on which all the grammarians agree is the case of what Sweet calls "detached auxiliary": *never* and *ever* always precede a detached finite verb. This also is an absolute rule; in fact it is the same as the preceding one, since the detached verb is stressed (Jones § 981, 988):

- (82) But he's never come, and I don't think he ever will. (XXXVII 162)  
 (83) Ernest, we may never be married. From the expression on mother's face I fear we never shall. (XXXIX 82)  
 (84) A.: "I hope to-morrow will be a fine day, Lane." — L.: "It never is, Sir." (XXXIX 87)  
 (85) As dead as anybody ever is. (IX 236)

The same happens if the detached verb is followed by an adjunct <sup>1</sup>:

- (86) The atmosphere struck him as it never had before, ... (IV 199)  
 (87) Charlatans are now less criticized or cross-examined than they ever were in the world before. (XXI 2.11.1929)

We cannot, of course, consider as exceptions sentences like:

- (88) You shall not — not ever. (III 76)  
 (89) "We are a harem." — "Why, what do you mean?" cried the younger girl in great agitation. "Why, Lord Ivywood has never — —" — "I know he has never. I am not sure," said Joan, "even whether he would ever." (XIX 303)

It is worth underlining that when final position is given to the verb *be*, in the sense of *exist*, it is stressed (cf. Jones, loc. cit.) and preceded by the adverb:

- (90) There will be "no difficulty about the im"portant questions: there 'never "is: (IV 364, quoted with stress-marks by Armstrong-Ward p. 75)

<sup>1</sup> This is not mentioned by the grammarians.



- (91) She told it to me as a marvellous story of something that never happened to a Lilith that never was. (VIII 83)  
 (92) Please imagine all the rot that all the lovers that ever were have talked, and all my special rot in. (XIV 202)

There is another point which has completely escaped the attention of the grammarians : sometimes the detached verb is composed of two words. There are then two possibilities illustrated by the following quotations :

- (93) What I say is — we're not equal and we never can be. (XVIII 23)  
 (94) You are not married to her already, and I don't think you ever will be. (XXXIX 25)  
 (95) She was what Hilda could never be, had never long desired to be. (XXXVII 77)  
 (96) At this time, Jack was richer than he had ever been before. (I 175)  
 (97) But there was less variety in social behaviour than there had ever been before or since. (XXI 28.12.1929)

The finite verb is strongly stressed in 93—94 (see note 3, p. 8), it is not in 95—97; this difference of stress determines the difference of construction : the rule is the same as with complete predicates.

We shall now proceed to the most important part of our study: though it is an absolute rule that when the finite verb (of the kind of I, B) is strong-stressed, *never* and *ever* precede it, yet these adverbs may precede an *unemphatic* finite verb. (In fact, this case is quite as frequent — or better, as rare — as the one just described). Sweet does not allude to this possibility. Kruisinga gives some examples, but no commentary. Poutsma's only example has been discussed page 134. Fijn van Draat adduces so many examples that he gives an impression (a false one) that this construction is as frequent as that described in I, B.

This placing of strong-stressed *never* or *ever* before an unemphatic finite verb occurs in sentences expressing a strong feeling or a firm conviction<sup>1</sup>; it is a more colloquial substitute for the exclusively literary front-position (see p. 138) and, characteristically, is more frequently found in authors like Shaw, Wells and Chesterton, than in authors like Galsworthy, Bennett, Wilde. We first give three examples in which the stress is indicated by the author :

- (98) If you accuse a man of being a drunkard he will say "I never was drunk in my life," emphasizing the "never", not the auxiliary. (Shaw, Letter to the author)  
 (99) "Well, I "never was so com"pletely taken "in in my "life. (Sweet, Primer of Spoken English, p. 79)  
 (100) I never, *never* could stand it if she came down on me and you. (XLIV 333)

The comparison between the next two examples is conclusive as to the kind of sentences in which this construction is found. Both are taken from Shaw; in the first, a very cultivated man is speaking; note the literary style; he is shocked in his aesthetic opinions :

- (101) Gentlemen: do not speak to me. I implore you to withhold your opinion. I am not strong enough to bear it. I could never have believed it. Is this a play? (VI 104)

In the next, Shaw tells us what is the mental state of the speaker, a kind-hearted, simple-minded man; his feelings are deeply stirred :

<sup>1</sup>) There are, however, sentences of this sort, in which this construction is not used.

- (102) Sir Pearce (sitting down again, exhausted by his feelings): Well, I never could have believed this. Never. (VII 205)

The former construction reveals an intellectual, logical, turn of mind; the latter a more sentimental, spontaneous, one. Similarly, it is a firm, almost fatalistic, belief, and not a scientific law, that is expressed in Shaw's famous:

- (103) You never can tell. (IV 251)

On the contrary, we have a more objective statement in :

- (104) But you can never tell all an invention will do. (XXV 158)

In the following quotation a *woman* expresses her strong feeling; her interlocutor, a *man*, takes up her sentence and slightly modifies it. This requires more intelligence than emotion, and accordingly, the adverb takes its normal place again :

- (105-106) "One never should keep these things," said Connie. — "That one shouldn't! One should never have them made!" (XLIV 234)

The same difference is found in the following pairs of examples :

- (107) She who never before had vividly seen herself as married to a man! (XXXVII 163)  
 (108) Poor Clara, who appeared to Higgins and his mother as a disagreeable and ridiculous person, and to her own mother as in some inexplicable way a social failure, had never seen herself in either light. (V 267)  
 (109) We never ought to have married. But I never expected *this*. (XXVII 254)  
 (110) Even women had taken his wife's part so far as to say that he ought never to have married her. (I 222)  
 (111) Georgie thought, once more, that he never in this world should understand grown-up people. (XXXII 318)  
 (112) It may be that we shall never fully understand why our fathers did it. (XXI 25.4.1931)  
 (113) I should, of course, entirely accept that Copernican victory; it never would occur to me to do anything else. (XXI 11.7.1931)  
 (114) That, indeed, sent his heart into his mouth, for if these strange creatures succeeded in stopping that, his release would never occur. (XXVIII 91)  
 (115) By Jingo, if we didn't fight fairer than that in the ring, we'd be disqualified in the first round. It's the first cross I ever was mixed up in, and I hope it will be the last. (II 330)  
 (116) No one is ever tired of stories of miracles. (VIII 63: Preface)  
 (117) "Queer old Artie!" — "Ain't I? I don't suppose there ever was a chap quite like me before." (XXXI 271)  
 (118) I cried like a child when I heard of it: I don't think there was ever anything so cruel. (II 287)  
 (119) Miss Carew's generosity to me has been unparalleled. And she does not seem to know that she is generous. I owe more to her than I ever can repay. (II 168)  
 (120) Don't think, my boy, that I cannot see in you, young as you are, promise of higher powers than I can ever pretend to. (IV 139)  
 (121) He wouldn't be here now if it hadn't been for that. You're the only person that he ever has really cared for, and I can tell you that he likes you better than he likes me. (XXXVI 342)  
 (122) I don't believe he's ever really cared for my mother. (XIV 149)

As we said, this placing of the strong-stressed adverb before an unemphatic finite verb is a more colloquial substitute for the literary post-position; and this is confirmed by the fact that in all these sentences the subject is a monosyllable, so that the place of the adverb is nearly front-position. We even have

sentences in which the subject, or the adverb *there*, is dropped, so that *never* is the first element :

(123) Never could shee (i.e. see) anything wonderful in her looks. (XV 281)

(124) "She's a good 'un." Then a sob. "Never was one like her!" (XXXVI 135)

Between all the examples (71—125) with the adverb before the finite verb, stressed or not, — all emphatic sentences — there is something in common, which is precisely that non-logical character we found in the examples just above. If we turn back to the examples page 134, we see that, logically, *never* or *ever*<sup>1</sup>, and not the finite verb, should be emphasized in 74—76, for example. Similarly, *never* should logically be emphasized and *do* should not be used in 21 and in the next :

(125) No experience would suffice to cure her trick of continually expecting him to notice things which he never did notice. (XXXIII 315)

For more examples of such use of distributed stress, we refer the reader to our article "On some rare instances of distributed stress" in *Neophilologus*, Oct. 1933.

## B. Front-position.

Real front-position is given to *never* only; *ever* is always in a subordinate clause and follows a relative pronoun or a conjunction. (For interrogative elements, see p. 144).

### 1. *Never*.

As is well known, *never* is given front-position for the sake of emphasis. But what the grammarians do not say is that this only happens in literary style or in solemn speech. We have this construction in about 1,5 % of our sentences.

(126) Never was anything so intoxicating as that vivacious look. (XIV 104)

(127) Never has there been a fairer examination within my experience. (IV 190 Preface)

(128) And what is more, never will I raise my voice in song again! James Yarlett has sung his last song. (XXXVI 88)

This construction is possible in subordinate clauses :

(129) With incredible dignity those birds moved, as if never in their lives had they been hurried. (XVI 48)

(130) Blunt, with many blasphemies, testified that never had he met so apt a pupil. (XXV 224)

Sometimes an adjunct immediately follows *never* :

(131) And never for a moment did they stop cooing. (X 155)

(132) Never, in fact, not even by the death of her husband, had she received such a frightful blow as that which the dreamy Cyril had just dealt her. (XXXIII 319)

---

<sup>1</sup> This probably explains Poutsma's error concerning 67.



2. *Ever*.

A very peculiar example is the following, which very much resembles those with *never*:

- (133) It was superstitious, and addicted to table-rapping, materialization séances, clairvoyance, palmistry, crystal-gazing and the like to such an extent that it may be doubted whether ever before in the history of the world did soothsayers, astrologers, and unregistered therapeutic specialists of all sorts flourish as they did during this half century of the drift to the abyss. (VII 18)

Just as with *never*, the adverb *ever* has brought about the placing of the subject after the finite verb. It is the only case we have met with.

But it is not so rare to find *ever* before the subject of a subordinate clause (this construction occurs in about 4.5 % of our sentences); in such a case the adverb sometimes loses part or all of its temporal meaning<sup>1</sup> and becomes something intermediary between an adverb of degree and an adverb of modality. This construction is described by the OED (*Ever* II, 8). Fijn van Draat adduces a few examples and considers this construction as a means "to achieve the rhythm-group: X—X—;" but he forgets that the same rhythm-group would be achieved with the normal construction. The fact is that *ever* is placed before the subject for the sake of emphasis.

a. *Ever* can be placed for emphasis before the subject in comparative clauses introduced by *as* or *than*, also in relative clauses introduced by *that* preceded by a superlative or by *the only*, *every*, *the first*; in this place the adverb becomes an intensive element, e.g.:

- (136) Well, I'm going to help her, just as much as ever I can. (XXIX 51)

This sentence means: I'm going to help her very much. The temporal meaning of *ever* is lost. Other examples are:

- (137) In our little town, which is a sample of many, life is as interesting, as pathetic, as joyous as ever it was. (LII 37)  
 (138) He wrote in shorthand as fast as ever I could read to him, and then he read out what he'd written, without a single slip. (XXXVII 64)

The temporal meaning is not always quite lost:

- (139) When I've done with it the tooth will be as sound as ever it was. (XXXII 165)

These four examples are to be opposed to ordinary comparisons, like:

- (140) She was certainly as handsome at forty as she had ever been. (XIV 27) Cf. 85.

We have 14 sentences with *ever* immediately after *as*, but only 6 with *ever* after the subject. Examples with *than* are less characteristic and less frequent (only 6 with *ever* before the subject against 70 others):

- (141) In 1906 I might have vituperated Jehovah more heartily than ever Shelley did without eliciting a protest in any circle of thinkers. (VIII 36)  
 (142) I am happier now I am half dead than ever I was in my prime. (VII 180)  
 (143) There are wider seas than ever keel sailed upon, and deeps no lead of human casting will ever plumb. (XXIX 43)

<sup>1</sup> This loss of sense is sometimes found with another construction:

- (134) He had cursed the day when he had ever been married. (XI 231)  
 (135) Never did the music ever mean so much as it did to-night. (XLVII 64)

The temporal meaning of *ever* is diminished in these examples, chiefly the first two; but it is reinforced by *before* in the next one, where the adverb has its normal place:

- (144) At this time, Jack was richer than he had ever been before. (I 175)

Examples with *that* are very rare: 5 with *ever* before the subject against 203 others. Of the two following sentences, the first insists on the degree of delicacy (*fine, finer, finest*); the second insists on *first (unprecedented)*: the last member of it might be replaced by "this very first night out":

- (145) But even then I remember how I noted the infinite delicacy of her childish skin and the fine eye-brow, finer than the finest feather that ever one felt on the breast of a bird. (XXIII 26)  
 (146) Kipps prepared to face Mr. Shalford and the reckoning for this wild unprecedented night — the first "night out" that ever he had taken. (XXX 138)

There is much less insistence on the degree, and *ever* has its normal place in:

- (147) His manners, his counter manners, were the easiest she had ever seen upon him. (XXX 147)  
 (148) I think she's the most beautiful woman I ever saw. (XIV 207)  
 (149) I made the best recruiting speech I ever made in my life. (VII 237)

It is characteristic of the value of *ever* placed before the subject, that this construction occurs chiefly after a comparative of equality, less frequently after a comparative of superiority, and rarely after a superlative: by itself, a superlative already indicates a strong degree, no other adverb of degree is required in most cases; on the contrary, a comparative of equality indicates no superiority of degree and, therefore, can easily be accompanied by an adverb of degree.

b. *Ever* can be added for emphasis to the conjunctions *as soon as, before, ere*, says the OED; we are able to add the conjunctions *since* and *while*. This case is really the same as the preceding one: *as soon as* is evidently a comparative of equality; *before* and *ere* have the value of comparatives of superiority: *earlier than* is what they mean. *Since* is felt to mean *as soon as*, and *while* to mean *as long as*.

- (150) I'll write as soon as ever I get there! (XXXIII 325) cf. 157.  
 (151) Mrs. Bunting always put a rope round each of her daughters before ever they put a foot in the water, and held it until they were safely out again. (XXIX 14)  
 (152) It was all as it had been Sunday after Sunday since ever Anwrel knew Wolding. (IL 224)  
 (153) Stay, Master, while ever you will. (XLI 17)

No such emphasis is found in:

- (154) We may die and rot before we ever see again such a moon or such a mood. (XX 184)

c. *Ever* can also be placed for emphasis after the conjunction *if*. (This construction is not mentioned by the OED.)

- (155) If ever I utter an oath again, may my soul be blasted to eternal damnation. (IX 113)  
 (156) If ever a revolution makes me Dictator, I shall establish a heavy charge for admission to our churches. (VII 53)  
 (157) "Glad to see you, Man Friday," says I, for I had naturally settled he was to be called Man Friday if ever he was hatched, as soon as ever I found the egg in the canoe had developed. (XXIV 166)  
 (158) If ever I want you to do anything, you've always got a headache. (XI 245)

- (159) And yet the sort of people who incessantly sing the praises of Abraham Lincoln have got hold of a man quite as incongruous to their own conception of a hero — if ever they could turn from imagining a hero to considering the man. (XXI 17.11.1928)

No such emphasis is found in the following sentences:

- (160) "Imagine a man writing that stuff," he said, "if he'd ever been at Eton." (XV 163)  
 (161) I'm a Conservative — at least, if I ever took the trouble to vote, I should vote for the Conservative, and against the other fellow. (III 80)  
 (162) The name of Shushions meant nothing to him; he had forgotten it, if indeed he had ever wittingly heard it. (XXXV 297)

A special kind of *if*-clause is that which serves to emphasize the principal clause or part of it. We have 12 such sentences: only one of them places *ever* after the subject, which clearly shows that *ever* placed before the subject is a means to achieve emphasis:

- (163) Here is the place, after all! Here is Reed Island, if ever there was one. (XX 185)  
 (164) Then there was Old Dean Arthur, who discovered balloons, if ever a man did. (XIX 86)  
 (165) If ever I saw a man hopelessly hard-up it was the man in front of me. (XXIV 134)  
 (166) But if ever a servant was put into her place by mere tone. Amy was put into her place on that occasion. (XXXIV 211)

The only exception is:

- (167) If he had ever doubted his creed of tolerance he did so then. (XIII 253)

The conclusion is easy to draw: *ever* receives front-position for the sake of emphasis and then becomes an intensive element.

### C. Immediately after the principal verb.

This placing of *never* and *ever* is exceptional.

We have two sentences in which the adverb follows *have* in the sense of *possess* (for the normal place, see 15—16):

- (168) "The fixed idea," which has outrun more constables than any other form of human disorder, has never more speed and stamina than when it takes the avid guise of love. (XIV 256)  
 (169) It is very fine work, and afterwards you have to get them dusty, for no one who owns one of these precious eggs has ever the temerity to clean the thing. (XXIV 65)

This might be thought to be done in analogy with sentences containing the auxiliary *have*, as it certainly is in interrogative sentences:

- (170) Had any man ever such a cruel moment to go through? (XII 245)  
 (171) Had you never a brother of any kind? (XXXIX 179)

If *have* was treated like an ordinary verb, we should have: Did any man ever have ..., Did you never have ...<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The true reason might also be thought to be that the subject of 168 and 169 is a very long one; but here are two quotations with a long subject followed by the normal construction:

- (172) Even dentists who bought a practice ready-made never had a client on their first day. (XXXII 160)  
 (173) My father had a little, but I don't believe any other of the old Forsytes ever had a scrap. (XIII 66)



But there is no such reason for the placing of *never* after the verb in the following sentences:

- (174) And the incisive argument, the instances delved out of history, came never upon the foolscap. (IL 223)  
 (175-176) Nothing endures, all is as vapour ... Is it that we are but the breath of the earth? Though the mortal wearies never of the dryad and though I never wearied of Elizabeth who was certainly of dryad heredity, my love came to an end. (XLVIII 20)

This last quotation is very instructive with its double construction and its change of tone: it clearly shows that the construction with *never* after the verb is rather affected; it is characteristic of the style of some authors: Lord Dunsany (174), G. Moore (175). We attribute to a certain affectedness the construction in 168 too; but not that in 169, which belongs to colloquial English. We shall make the same distinction in the following section.

#### D. End-Position.

This placing is as rare as the preceding one. Examples with *never* are found in literary style only, while examples with *ever* are found in colloquial language. But in both cases the adverb is made prominent. (The grammarians except Poutsma are mute on this, as well as on the preceding, point.)

##### 1. *Never*.

Poutsma gives an example of it (§ 58):

- (177) He who has loved often, has loved never. (*Last Days of Pompeii*)

This construction is evidently due to the opposition between *often* and *never*. In the following sentence there is a similar opposition between *perhaps* and *never*:

- (178) This stream of people came from every quarter, as if impulse had unlocked flood-gates, let flow waters of whose existence he had heard, perhaps, but believed in never. (XIII 235)

But there is no parallelism to justify end-position in the following quotations. (In two of them an adjunct of time accompanies the adverb.)

- (179) Remember this is a magical *tête-à-tête* which will happen never again in your life. (XLV 255)  
 (180) Such a glorious glow of whiteness was attained never before. (XLV 58)  
 (181) The principal marvel of that music seemed to be that it could enchant old memories, long long since dead you had fancied, and bring them out of a time you thought utterly buried, and set them living in minds that had known them never, and had barely guessed them in dreams. (IL 264)

This construction in 179-181 is characteristic of the rather affected style of Lord Dunsany and G. Moore; cf. 56, 174-175.

##### 2. *Ever*.

Here end-position is the result of negligence. Our first example is evidently spoken by an uneducated person:

(182) You slams the door in their face, and that's all we see of 'em ever! (XXXI 224)

The next is quoted by Jespersen (*Negation in English*, p. 46) as belonging to colloquial English:

(183) You shan't touch those hostels ever again. Ever! (Wells, H 442)

In the following example *ever* could not be placed anywhere else, as the negative element (*nobody*) follows the verb:

(184) And when I do them they only throw me coppers and sometimes tickes, and say what a wonderful man I am, and that there has been nobody like me ever on earth. (Shaw, *Adv. of a black girl*, quoted in *Review of Reviews*, Jan. 1933)

The last part of this sentence means: there has never been anybody like me. This normal construction has been departed from in order to lay all the stress on *nobody*.

Our three examples have this in common, that they belong to colloquial language and that they begin with a restrictive (*all*) or negative (*not*, *nobody*) element and lay great stress on it; *ever* is shifted to have its stress preserved.

## Interrogative sentences.

### I. Normal place.

#### A. The subject is an interrogative pronoun.

*Ever* has the same place as in declarative sentences. (We have not found any example with *never*, but there is no reason for supposing that it would be given another place).

(185) I told her I was going to fight for the French and for the Russians; and sure who ever heard of the French or the Russians doing anything to the English but fighting them? (VII 204)

(186) But who has ever refused to accept a good legend with delight as a legend? (VIII 63)

(187) Who would ever have thought that he could feel as he did to this girl who had been in the arms of many? (XII 45)

#### B. The subject is not an interrogative pronoun.<sup>1</sup>

The adverb is placed after the subject:<sup>2</sup>

(190) Have you never read your Tennyson? (I 21)

(191) My God! did these pink-faced, intriguing generals of ours never dream of nights? (XXII 237)

(192) And are you really never without your revolver? (XXXII 330)

(193) Would the world ever have been made if its maker had been afraid of making trouble? (V 253)

(194) But don't they ever just only pretend to kill one another? (V 122)

(195) Had any man ever such a cruel moment to go through? (XII 245) cf. 171.

<sup>1</sup> It is without interest to consider such interrogative sentences as the following; they obey the rules given in the preceding section:

(188) You have never heard of papa, I suppose? (XXXIX 156)

<sup>2</sup> None of Fijn van Draat's formulae is found in the following sentence where *you* only is stressed:

(189) Have 'you ever been there? (Jones § 1057)

In the next two sentences *there* takes the place of the subject:

- (196) Was there ever a more ungracious, ungrateful, unreasonable creature than this same Chatteris? (XXIX 184)  
 (197) Would there ever be someone who would fill him with a strange idolatry? (XL 151)

The interrogative construction is sometimes kept in a subordinate clause:

- (198) This gentleman wants to know is he never to have the last word? (VII 137)  
 (199) I wonder do we ever succeed really in communicating our thoughts to one another. (II 110)

### C. Interrogative construction in non-interrogative sentences.

The adverb stands after the subject. (Of course, an adjunct can immediately precede or follow):

- (200) Had an expression ever arisen upon these features, it is impossible to say what might have been the consequences. (X 6)  
 (201) Had Oken never lived, there would still have been millions of persons trained from their childhood to believe that we are continually urged upwards by a force called the Will of God. (VIII 26)  
 (202) The exact nature of his disease I do not know nor was it I think ever clearly known. (XXXII 30)  
 (203) Not only have I never attended a rehearsal, but I have never seen a performance of any of my plays. (XXXI 78)  
 (204) May he never want a friend or a bottle. (XIX 231)

## II. Less frequent positions.

The grammarians are mute on these points.

A. Interrogative sentences that have more the character of exclamations, — that is, more emotional sentences — generally place *ever* before the subject, chiefly when the latter is not a personal pronoun:

- (205) Was ever so idiotic a project mooted as the estimation of virtue in money? (V 55)  
 (206) "Did ever man have such a bother with himself as me?" he asked vaguely, but vehemently. (XXVII 113)  
 (207) Did ever anybody hear of such a thing? (VI 93)  
 (208) "Was ever anything so odd!" she at last exclaimed to herself, in her own room. (LIII 191)  
 (209) Why, did ever you see! (XLIV 688)

But:

- (210) Did anyone ever hear the like of this? (V 104)  
 (211) Shall I ever forget him! (IV 40)

B. *Ever* can be placed immediately after interrogative pronouns or adverbs to intimate that the speaker has no notion what the answer will be. (cf. OED: *Ever* II, 8, d). Once more, the earlier occurrence of *ever* is due to a subjective element:

- (212) Had I happened upon a set of drawings by Raphael I could not have been more astonished. ... "Who ever," I cried, "could have left these copies of the Athenaeum here?" (XLVIII 174)



- (213) "Oh, but my dear," cried Mrs. Orgreave, "why ever didn't you tell them downstairs, or let me know earlier?" (XXXVII 357)  
 (214) Mrs. Lessways began to weep. "What ever's the matter?" (XXXVII 89)

Such a construction is also found in subordinate clauses introduced by the same pronouns or adverbs, or by the conjunction *if*:

- (215) And I wondered, when I was in the train, whatever I should do if you weren't there! (XLII 131)  
 (216) "Well!" Constance murmured, "I can't think how ever he dared go there all alone!" (XXXIII 216)  
 (217) It's curious 'ow ever we got on to be engaged! (XXXI 167)  
 (218) I was jest thinking of *you*, Sid, jest this very moment, and wondering if ever I should see you again — ever. And 'ere you are! (XXXI 16)  
 (219) He scanned it curiously, wondering if ever before it had concealed the secret of man's life. (XL 124)  
 (220) The pasture's bitten down to nothing. I dunno if ever I s'll get the rent off it. (XLI 159)

An example with *where* will be found in the OED (loc. cit.) which, on the other hand, does not give any with *if*:

C. Among more than 300 interrogative sentences, we have only found one with *ever* after the second verbal:

- (221) I knew I had a brother! I always said I had a brother! Cecily, — How could you have ever doubted that I had a brother? (XXXIX 229)

Similarly we have an example of end-position:

- (222) How do you young ladies amuse yourself in the country? Do you play billiards ever? (II 98)

Both belong to colloquial language, like 182-184.

### Imperative sentences.<sup>1</sup>

#### I. *Never*.

##### A. In the second person.

*Never* always precedes the finite verb (and the subject if there is one):

- (223) Do not forget that, Adam. Never forget it! (VIII 87)  
 (224) Lor', Miss Truda, never you make a face! You might grow so! (X 6)  
 (225) Never be afraid of animals, your worship. (V 141)  
 (226) Get your enemy at a disadvantage; and never, on any account, fight him on equal terms. (IV 57)

##### B. In the first and third persons.

*Never* normally follows *let*, but precedes it for the sake of emphasis:

- (227) "Won't you speak to me?" he said resolutely. — "Just this," she replied without passion, "Let me never see you again." (II 276)  
 (228) Get out of my sight; never let me see you again. (XI 373)  
 (229) Never let your wife know what you're thinking of. (XI 103)  
 (230) Let us love and hate, let us work and marry, but let us never give ourselves away. (XV 220)

<sup>1</sup>) This point is hardly touched by the grammarians.

II. *Ever*.

*Ever* always follows *don't* and the subject if there is one. This formula *don't ever* is much less frequent than *never*: we find it in 16 % of our imperative sentences only:

- (231) Don't ever borrow, except from me, will you? (XIII 54)  
 (232) Don't ever be persuaded into doing what you don't want. (XII 124)  
 (233) And don't you ever dare speak to me again. (VIII 185).

## The adverb accompanies an infinitive, participle or gerund.

I. *Never*.

*Never* always precedes these verbals, their number having no influence. (No split infinitive with *never*).

- (234) I've a good mind never to speak to you again. (III 76)  
 (235) She resolved never again, by look or sign, to interrupt the steady flow of this man's life. (LIII 141)  
 (236) He seemed never to be solemn over his religion, like the Wesleyans. (XXXVI 128)  
 (237) This taste enthralled him for years, and, indeed, may be said never to have left him. (XL 175)  
 (238) From the look they gave him he saw that he had better never have been born. (XV 208)  
 (239) He sat there as though youth had left him, unmoving, never lifting his eyes. (X 264)  
 (240) Edwin knew not what had come over him, and Darius, never having been addressed in such a dangerous tone by his son, was at a loss. (XXXV 320)  
 (241) At first, anxious to show her lover that she trusted him, she seemed never tired of doing things for his young protégé, as though she too had set her heart on his salvation. (XV 245)  
 (242) It was a shameful secret, never even referred to. (XXXVII 25)  
 (243) There's a kind of freedom that consists in never rebelling against Nature. (XIX 295)  
 (244) England might be sunk under the sea; which would be better for England than never again having such places as "The Old Ship". (XIX 39)  
 (245) It was like never having seen an audience before. (XXXI 260)  
 (246) Yet it was so simple, so obvious, that I was amazed at my never anticipating the thing that was happening to me. (XXVIII 120)

But there is a tendency, in sentences where the infinitive follows a form of *seem* or *mean*, to transpose *never* before the finite verb for the sake of emphasis:

- (247) Men never seem to me to grow up. (IV 90)

This sentence means: men seem to me never to grow up. But the same author uses the normal construction in:

- (248) You people seem<sup>1</sup> never to tire of listening to your voices. (VIII 241)

An example with *mean*:

- (249) It ... was slowly and steadily continued as if the player never meant to stop. (I 155) i.e. meant never to stop.

Other instances of *seem* followed by *never* are 236 and 241.

<sup>1</sup> Fijn van Draat writes that the adverb is invariably placed before *seem*. The other grammarians do not allude to this.

II. *Ever*.

*Ever* always precedes a single verbal:

- (250) Who could be expected ever to forgive that? (XXX 44)
- (251) In point of appeal to the senses no theatre ever built could touch the fane at Rheims. (VII 52)
- (252) But what chance of his ever being able to say: "I'm free"? (X 250)
- (253) I never had a brother in my life, and I certainly have not the smallest intention of ever having one in the future. (XXXIX 178)
- (254) And now I see what a fool one is ever to be happy. (XXII 227)

A curious example is the following (too long to be quoted at length):

- (255) ... brains which have become too sceptical of human nature ever themselves to act on vague humanitarian impulses in this way. (J. Cleugh, in *The Nineteenth Century*, Jan. 1933, p. 99)

Just as with *never* there is a tendency, when the infinitive follows certain verbs, to transpose *ever* before the finite verb for the sake of emphasis; this verb being in the negative form, *not* and *ever* are fused into *never*:

- (256) ... an old and terrible feeling that he never remembered to have felt before. (X 268)  
i.e. that he didn't remember ever to have felt before.

The normal construction is found in 261-262 and in the following quotation:

- (257) I did not remember her ever to have been ill. (XLVIII 236)

When the verbal form is a complex one, *ever* either precedes or follows the first verbal element, the former construction being used for the sake of emphasis (the distinction is not always easy to make):

- (258) If you are not quite sure about your ever having been christened, I must say I think it rather dangerous your venturing on it now. (XXXIX 188)
- (259) It was a mistake for me ever to have attempted it. (I 283)
- (260) There is so little likelihood of my ever being given a choice, that I haven't wasted time considering. (XLII 67)
- (261) He did not remember ever having been quite alone with Irene before. (XI 89)

This last is to be compared with the following in which the opposition between two elements attracts the attention (and the stress) to them:

- (262) For while he could always remember afterwards that he had swooned before the face of Sunday, he could not remember having ever come to at all. (XVII 295)

Other examples of post-position are:

- (263) There is no evidence of his having ever brushed them. (IV 131)
- (264) Don't seem to have ever heard of being alive. (XXVII 74)
- (265) ... the secret reason of horse-racing being to afford an example of perpetual motion (no proper racing-man having ever been found to regard either gains or losses in the light of an accomplished fact). (X 33)

We have found an example of end-position; like 182-184 and 221-222, it belongs to colloquial language:

- (266) I don't wish to speak to you ever again. (II 202)



It is a more polite formula for: I wish never to speak to you again. We have here a very curious case of "cleaving of *never*" and "nexal attraction". (cf. Jespersen, p. 46).

### Conclusions.

This description of the different possibilities in the placing of *never* and *ever* allows us to make some more general remarks:

I. Though these adverbs may occupy different places there is *extremely* little freedom in their placing: when we speak of their normal place, we mean a construction that occurs in about 95 % of our sentences (8-54, 57-64, 185-204, 223-227, 230-246, 250-255, 262-265). Sentence-rhythm is too proteiform to be considered as determining this construction and this frequency. If Fijn van Draat's formulae are often true, they are not so always. All that can be retained in this connexion is that the speaker or writer generally avoids the close succession of stresses, chiefly emphatic stresses; but this is sometimes done by simply omitting the stress of some word or other; even *never* and *ever* may lose their stress: see 10 and 72. It is quite as true to say that sentence-rhythm adapts itself to word-order, as the reverse. In fact, they generally adapt themselves to one another. But in the placing of *never* and *ever*, we find so little freedom that we can but say that traditional word-order is the stronger by far.

II. In sentences expressing a strong feeling or conviction, there is a general tendency to introduce the adverb sooner: in literary style at the head of the sentence (126-133), in ordinary language after the subject, the relative pronoun, the conjunction or the interrogative element (98-125, 134-167, 205-220, 228, 229, 247-249, 256, 258-261). This is natural: emotion cannot wait, it must exteriorize itself as soon as possible; therefore, the emphatic element is introduced earlier; this phenomenon might be called *precession of the emotional stress*<sup>1</sup>. (Sometimes the subject is even dropped: 123, 124, and also 77, in which the emphatic element is the auxiliary). Leisured virtuosity, on the contrary, will sometimes resort to unusual constructions in order to obtain some special effect (55, 168, 174-181).

III. In spoken language, *never* cannot be placed after the verb; but we have found a few sentences with *ever* in that place, as a consequence of carelessness (56, 169, 182-184, 221-222, 266). This difference of treatment is evidently due to the negative element in *never*: in spoken English the normal place of the negative adverbs *not* and *never* is before the predicate, so that there is no danger for the listener to believe at first that the sentence is an affirmative one. We say "before the predicate" because the auxiliary, when there is one, is less important than the rest of the predicate (when it becomes important, and is stressed, *never*<sup>2</sup> precedes: 65-97). When *not* accompanies an ordinary verb in a simple tense, this position before the predicate is made

<sup>1</sup> The same psychological explanation applies to the Rhythmical Variations described by Jones (§ 935): "When it is desired to emphasize words which have both a primary and a secondary stress, and in which the secondary stress precedes the primary, the secondary stress is often reinforced and becomes as strong as the primary stress." This is also a case of earlier stressing.

<sup>2</sup> In the case of *not* this construction is not necessary, as *not* becomes an enclitic of the verb under the form of *n't*.

possible by the use of *don't*, *doesn't*, *didn't*. This tendency to place the negative adverb before the predicate probably helped to originate the illogical constructions of 247, 249 and 256; and, inversely, it explains why it is not so necessary to place *ever* (positive element) before the stressed auxiliary in a sentence like 81.

Brussels.

E. BUYSENS.

## Reviews.

*Kommentar zum Beowulf*. Von JOHANNES HOOPS. Pp. X + 333. Heidelberg, 1932. RM. 8.

In the *Vorwort* of this admirable book Professor Hoops tells us that his commentary is meant to serve as a supplement to the various editions of *Beowulf* published in recent years. The present review may be described, not inaccurately, as a supplement to H.'s commentary. In my discussion of the volume I will confine myself almost wholly to matters which in my opinion have received inadequate or unsatisfactory treatment. Let me begin, however, by paying tribute to H.'s mastery of the subject, fairness to those with whom he does not agree, clarity and penetration. His book is indeed a notable one, an ornament to Beowulfian scholarship and a work of reference to which students of the English epic will long turn for light in dark places.

19 (i.e. *Beowulf*, line 19): *Scede-* can hardly be derived from *Sceden-*, since evidence seems wanting that OE medial *n* was lost before *l*; the term *Scedelandum* here may mean 'Scandinavia' rather than 'Skåne' or 'Denmark.' 26 ff.: C. W. von Sydow's paper in *NoB* XII 63 ff. ought to have been taken into account. 57 *Healfdene*: the late Scandinavian story that this king's father was a Dane, his mother a Swede was obviously invented to explain his name and cannot be taken seriously. P. 18 (i.e. H.'s book, p. 18): the reference to Beibl. 42,201 should be deleted, since Holthausen here does not discuss the point at issue, viz., the system of name-giving used in the Scylding family; more appropriate would be a reference to A. Olrik, *Danmarks Heltedigtning* I 22 ff. (= *Heroic Legends of Denmark* pp. 43 ff.). 80 *beot*: a reference to the important article of Nyrop in *Nordisk Tidskrift* XII (1889) 312 ff. should have been given. P. 24: the failure of the *Widsith* poet to mention the burning of Heorot has little significance, since *Widsith* is exceedingly short and it would be unreasonable of us to expect its author to give us much information about a hall in which he seems to have taken no particular interest. 136 *worð-beala* is a misprint for *morð-beala*. P. 44: the term *Goth* is generic, not specific. H. therefore puts the matter wrongly when he says, "Die Gauten sind nicht mit den Goten identisch, obwohl sie von Ausländern oft mit ihnen verwechselt wurden." Nobody ever identified Geats and Goths, but there is good evidence that the Geats were a branch of the Goths, witness Jordanes (himself a Goth) and Saxo (hardly a foreigner in H.'s sense). The Jordanean name *Gautigoth* is quite parallel to *Visigoth* and *Ostrogoth* and cannot safely be ignored by conservative scholarship. 225 *Wederas*: the parallel \**Hreðas* which H. cites is wrongly constructed, I

think. Since the first element of the full form *Hreðgotan* unquestionably goes back to an earlier *\*Hroði-*, the short form of the tribal name ought to be an i-stem, and its nom. pl. would therefore be *\*Hreðe*. Cf. further the *Iste* and *Hræde* in *Widsith* 87 and 120, which seem to be short i-stem forms of *Eastgotan* and *Hradgotan* respectively.

P. 51: there is of course not the slightest hint, in our text or out of it, that the Wægmunding family (Swedish though it probably was) came from the Swedish Vendel. As regards Wulfgar, whom Stjerna connected with the Swedish Vendel by virtue of a bad translation of *Beowulf* 341,<sup>1</sup> the obvious homeland for this Danish court official is the Danish Vendel. One is surprised to find H. repeating such unwarranted speculations without warning the reader of their lack of foundation. 383 *West-Denum*: see *APhS* IV 88. 445 *mægen hreð manna* (MS): between *hreð* and *manna* there is a narrow space in the MS, a spacing of the kind often found between the component parts of a single word. Between *mægen* and *hreð*, on the other hand, the spacing is wide, and one may reasonably conclude that the scribe looked upon *mægen* as a word for itself. It follows that the reading *mægenhreð* is an emendation of the inherited text. 461 *Wilfingum*: a reference here to R. Much, *ZfdA* LVII 151-161, LXI 109 f., LXII 120 ff. would have been in place. P. 78: it is odd that H. prefers the (to my mind) fantastic identification of *Finna land* 580 with Lapland to Schück's quite reasonable connexion of the name with Finnheden. 612 *Wealhþeow*: the translation 'britische Dienerin' involves the assumption that the name was invented by the English poet — a most unlikely theory. If the Danish queen's name was of North-Germanic origin, as one must suppose in the absence of any indication to the contrary, it means rather 'Gaulish slave.' 760 *fingras*: see Lyons, *MLN* XLVI 443 f. 874 ff.: I translate, "... he said everything that he had heard tell of Sigemund: the warfare of the son of Wæls, with mighty deeds and many a thing unknown, ..." Here *ellendædum* is a dative of accompaniment and *Sigemunde* needs no emendation. 902 *mid Eotenum*: there is nothing in the text to indicate that Heremod fled to the Euts, nor have we any genuine evidence that the Euts were "die Erbfeinde der Dänen." Speculations on these matters have a legitimate place, but they ought to be presented as speculations, not as facts. 1069 *Healfdena*: on this name, see my paper in *AfnF* XLII 234 ff., a paper with which H. seems to be unacquainted. 1085 *þeodnes ðegne*: I now take this to be a dative of accompaniment, grammatically attached to *wealafe* 1084; H.'s dative of interest strikes me as unlikely. 1107 *icge*: see Zachrisson *SNPh* I 75 for yet another theory.

P. 144: it is wrong to say that the patronymic *Wælsinges* 877 "selbständig auftritt." This patronymic follows the true name (though a few words intervene) and it is used as a variation of that name. I have found no example in Old-Germanic poetry of a patronymic (as against a kenning) used without previous mention of the true name, and Hoops has failed to cite such an example. His statement that *Hunlafing* 1143 is a patronymic must therefore be taken as a mere dictum, unwarranted by any evidence and indeed directly contradicted by the evidence. 1199 *Brosinga mene*: we have no reason to think that this necklace ever belonged to Ermanric. 1200 *fealh* 'incurred': the emendation to *fleah* is unjustified. 1201 *geceas ecne ræd*: to be compared

<sup>1</sup> *Essays*, p. 55. Stjerna took OE. *leod* here to mean 'prince, lord,' whereas in fact, of course, it means simply 'man.'



is *Godes leoht geceas* 2469; both expressions mean 'he died' and in neither case is there any reference to a monastery. Cf. further on *Freaan wære* 27 and (for the verb) *bæl cure* 2818.

1257 *lange þrage*: this refers to *widcup* 1256, not to *lifde* 1257; the poet means to say that the vengeance taken by Grendel's mother proved to be, not merely a nine days' wonder but a deed the fame of which was handed down to later times. 1850 *þe*: H. has overlooked G. W. Small's valuable discussion of this passage, *Gmc. Case of Comparison* pp. 39 f. 1894 *leodum*: a dative of accompaniment which serves as a variation of *scapan* 1895; the *landweard* welcomes the Geats but makes no prophecy about their reception overseas. 1926 *Hygd*: this name is abstract, indeed, but no more so than is *Dryð*; the contrast between the two queens which the poet gives us may well have developed out of the contrast in the meaning of their names. 1961 *Heminges*: no emendation is needed; see *MLN* XLIII 302 note 6. 1983 *Hænum*: Hoops ignores Svensson's plausible explanation, *NoB* V 127 note. P. 225 *Bardi bellicosissimi*: I have not found this expression in Helmold. P. 226: I am puzzled to find H. taking for a historical event the fall of Healfdene at the hand of Froda; this slaying seems actually to have been a late poetical addition to the original story, an addition unknown to the *Beowulf* poet (cf. *StEPH* p. 140). 2063 *on ba healfē*: this phrase does not carry the implication that another slaying had taken place; the Danes were the *first* to break the oaths (by their insulting treatment of the Bards).

2220 *bu* (or *by*): from H.'s discussion one would never guess that this is the reading of the MS; here H. departs in a most striking (and unjustified) fashion from his usual conservative treatment of the inherited text. 2237 *si*: emendation to *se* is needless; see *Jespersen Misc.*, pp. 45 ff. 2307 *læg*: here again H. abandons his textual principles (see p. 16) in favor of an old but needless emendation.

P. 253: there is no statement in the text that Beowulf swam back to Geatland with 30 sets of war-gear; we are told only that he had 30 such sets *þa he to holme ..ag* (2362). Kemble's conjecture *stag* for the *..ag* of the text is of course possible enough; a somewhat better reading, however, I think, would be *beag* 'turned, fled,' inasmuch as Beowulf is represented as then in flight (cf. 2598, 2956). His 30 sets of war-gear had presumably been stripped from the bodies of as many Franks, whom he had overcome in the conflict. In other words, the booty is spoken of to bring out Beowulf's prowess in battle, not in swimming. This same prowess in battle is the theme of the lines immediately following (2363-6). Moreover, nothing is said of his disposal of booty upon his arrival in Geatland, though if he had actually brought any booty with him one would have expected him to present it to Heardred according to custom (cf. 2612 ff.). 2377 *him*: emendation to *hine* is hardly justifiable; the *him* reflects an acc. use of the dative form which later became general, the old acc. being given up. 2514 *mærðum*: a dative of accompaniment. The passage may be translated thus: "I will seek battle and glorious deeds, I will do battle and glorious deeds" (cf. 959, 2499, 2627). Emendation is needless. 2854 *wehte* (and *bræc* 1511): a conative, not a durative use. 3174 *duguðum*: a dative of accompaniment, serving as a variation of *ellenweorc* 3173; not an adverbial use.

*Pseudoklassizistisches und Romantisches in Thomsons "Seasons".*  
 Von Dr. ERNA ANWANDER. Leipzig, Bernhard Tauchnitz. 1930,  
 (Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, Heft XIII.) RM. 8.

James Thomson has of late attracted considerable interest amongst critics and literary historians, and rightly so, for with the recent excursions into the byways of eighteenth-century literature we are coming to see, more clearly than ever, that he occupied an important position in the development of English poetry. Frequently he has been referred to as a stepping-stone from the pseudo-classic to the romantic school of writers, or as a forerunner of Warton, Wordsworth and Coleridge at the end of the century; but never have his works been subjected to a detailed analysis with the object of ascertaining to what extent he may really be called a precursor of romanticism. It is this deficiency that Dr. Anwander sets out to supply; and on the whole her dissertation is a competent piece of work, executed with thoroughness and precision. It is set out methodically, with convenient headings and sub-headings, and after some hundred and twenty pages of exposition the author comes to the following conclusion:

"In Thomsons *"Seasons"* sind pseudoklassizistische und romantische Elemente auf das Engste verbunden. Beinahe jede Zeile zeugt von beiden Geschmacksrichtungen. Thomson ist nicht, wie im ersten Augenblick wohl scheinen mag, inhaltlich romantisch, formal aber pseudoklassizistisch. Er ist in beiden beides. Inhalt und Form sind Ausdruck beider seelischer Haltungen."

This general thesis she has certainly succeeded in proving, though one may be inclined to question specific points here and there in her work.

The book falls naturally into two main sections: that which deals with the subject-matter of *The Seasons*, and that which deals with the outward form and technique, and of these the first is the more satisfactory. Basically, Dr. Anwander shows, the poem is neo-classic in conception, though here and there we find departures from the typical neo-classic position which adumbrate the rural poetry of the next half-century. The attitude of the poet towards nature and the countryside, for instance, is still, in the main, an objective one; his work is a series of pictures of the country in the varying seasons of the year, and any subjective or psychological element rarely enters in. Then again, our author contends, in typical neo-classic style the natural scene is subordinated to the human element. But I am not sure that this is so. Certainly humanity and nature are rarely intermingled as they were later by Cowper and Wordsworth, but one feels that it would be nearer the truth to say that the two, though kept apart, were raised to the same level, and that in virtue of this modification of the neo-classic position, Thomson marks a definite step towards the romantic. It is true, as Dr. Anwander declares on pp. 76—77, that man was still regarded even by Thomson as the lord of creation, so that, apostrophising humanity, he could write,

For you the roving spirit of the wind  
 Blows Spring abroad: for you the teeming clouds  
 Descend in gladsome plenty o'er the world;  
 And the sun sheds his kindest rays for you,  
 Ye flower of human race.

and elsewhere in the same poem could assert that,

..... Man superior walks  
Amid the glad creation .....

But *The Seasons* does contain passages in which nature is described for its own sake, and this was rarely found among the true neo-classics. As our author herself points out, the landscape artists of the period could never paint a rural scene without putting a human figure somewhere in the picture, and it was the same with the majority of the poets. But there are passages of good natural description in Thomson, veritable word pictures, in which the human element never intrudes at all.

Of the four books of *The Seasons*, *Winter* was the first to appear. At first sight this might seem remarkable, for winter was a season which held little appeal for the neo-classicist; but, as Dr. Anwander shows, Thomson's attitude does not really mark any new departure. He was as blind to its beauties as ever Pope was, so that here again he ranged himself with the classicists. But on the other hand, his countryside is populated with actual rustic characters, and not with mere conventional nymphs and swains as was that of so many of the contemporary pastoral poets. If his woods and meadows were themselves somewhat idyllic, his characters were not. They were realistic.

When Dr. Anwander passes on to treat of the outward form and technique of *The Seasons*, one finds it a little difficult to see quite so much of the romantic in them as she claims there is. True, she has shown, quite convincingly, the influence of Milton in toning down and softening the rather rigid style of the neo-classic couplet to the more flexible measure of blank-verse; yet at the same time she admits that the poem abounds in Latinisms, circumlocutions, conventional phraseology, personification, allegory, hackneyed and trite similes from nature, and all the usual devices of the Augustan poet. In the face of this it is surely a little rash to claim, merely on the score of a few original figures of speech and the abandonment of the heroic couplet, a very marked romantic tendency. In fact, one might even go so far as to say that Dr. Anwander has demonstrated the opposite: that in spite of the romantic elements, technically *The Seasons* owes more to neo-classicism than has usually been suspected.

And now for a few general criticisms. At the very beginning of the study we detect a fault which is perhaps inseparable from the method of treatment our author has chosen to adopt; namely, a tendency to formulate too exclusive, hard-and-fast definitions. Literary cults, tastes, and fashions have never shown much inclination to confine themselves within chronological limits, and it is therefore a purely artificial distinction which Dr. Anwander draws when she declares that the pseudo-classic period stretches from 1650 to 1750, and the romantic from 1750 to 1830. Nor is it strictly correct, for in the former of these periods we find Lady Winchelsea and Shenstone, and in the latter Dr. Johnson. Then, too, she writes of Thomson's realistic country folk as though they were the first of their kind to appear in English poetry since the Restoration (p. 47), quite oblivious, apparently, of the *Rural Sports* and *The Shepherd's Week* of John Gay, which both ante-date *The Seasons* by some twelve or thirteen years. And is there really so close an affinity as Dr. Anwander claims between Thomson's rustic characters and those of Burns? (p. 48). True it is that Burns was well acquainted with *The Seasons*, but it is a far cry from this poem to such a piece as *The Cotter's Saturday Night*.



Ramsay, Shenstone, Gray, Cowper, Goldsmith and Fergusson, all these lie between them. As for Thomson's religion, so far as it is ascertainable from his poetry, it was Deistic. He is impressed by the harmony in nature, and draws from it beliefs akin to those of Bolingbroke and Pope.

A little more attention to the foregoing points might have improved Dr. Anwander's book; but I would not labour them unduly. Some are subjective, and matters of personal opinion, and none invalidate the main thesis, though if taken into consideration they would entail a shifting of emphasis at one or two stages of the work. At bottom they all come back to one thing — the lack of a sense of proportion and balance, and that is a fault which is liable to beset any author who tries to treat a subject apart from its historical background.

Sheffield.

FREDERICK T. WOOD.

---

*Henry Fielding's Theory of the Comic Prose Epic.* By ETHEL MARGARET THORNBURY. (University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature, no. 30.) 202 pp. Madison 1931.

This study was, as the author announces in the preface, originally written "in partial fulfillment" of the requirements for the doctor's degree at the University of Wisconsin.

On opening the book we may pause for a moment to wonder whether the table of contents tallies with the modest title the author has chosen for her work, but reading further, we find that she has set herself a more ambitious task than her nominal theme implies. The consequence is that the introductory chapters are much more interesting than those dealing with Fielding and his works, elucidating as they do what might be termed the general problem of the modern epic. The later chapters, in fact, contain hardly any new material, though they review in detail Fielding's definition of the Comic Prose Epic in *Joseph Andrews*, the epic structure of *Tom Jones* and Fielding's ideas about the verisimilar and the marvellous. The author is not the first to point out that the neatly articulated dramatic plot of *Tom Jones*, itself a great advance on the plot of *Joseph Andrews*, where some adventures exist entirely independent of the others, distinguishes Fielding's novels from the "chronicles" called *Gil Blas*, *Lazarillo de Tormes*, and *Le Roman Comique*; it is not the first time that Fielding's conception of the moral purpose of the epic, his conception of the comic spirit as a weapon for making people see their follies, is brought to the fore, nor does the discussion of Fielding's idea of "invention", which must be taken in the sense of discovery, shed any new light on this tenet of Renaissance criticism, any more than the observation that Fielding distinguishes history from epic "not so much on the basis of material, but on the basis of form." Other authors, too, have discussed Fielding's repudiation of machinery and the supernatural, his marvellous application of the surprising, which he has but very seldom strained. Fielding's agreement with Ben Jonson that the ridiculous arises from affectation, the incongruity between a man's pretensions and his inner being or actual behaviour, is well-known, just as the fact that not all Fielding's humorous characters, Parson Adams for instance, conform to the Jonsonian standard of humour.

In the chapters leading up to these discussions the author grapples successfully with a difficult problem. In four concise and suggestive chapters she interprets the past for the elucidation of Fielding's attitude towards, his conformity to and his deviation from epic theory, as in course of time it had been developed and applied by authors and critics. The author's first aim is to summarize the difficulty critics of the Renaissance encountered because Homer and Virgil were generally accepted as similar, whereas there is a huge difference in the spirit of the two poets, Virgil being more delicate, a fact which made Le Bossu point out that Virgil's poem is written in a softer mood than are the Homeric poems, which he accounts for by attributing to Virgil a conscious desire to instruct. The author's second object is to scrutinize in detail the use authors of Christian epics have made of the machinery and magic of the primitive epic, which leads her to submit that neither *Orlando Furioso* nor *Jerusalem Delivered* can be called national epics, as their charm lies more in their extravagances than in the sense they give of the whole life of a period of human existence. She then recounts the history of the attempts made in different countries, as the influence of the Renaissance made itself felt, to try and produce a great national epic and traces the development of the French epic and epic theory in the hands of George de Scudéry, Fénelon, Boileau, Le Bossu and Madame Dacier, concluding with a review of the development of the epic in England. The pages dealing with Davenant, his preface to *Gondibert* and his responsibility for two innovations in the epic, those in which Milton's agreement with Le Bossu, in making a "fable" the germ of his poem, is discussed, the paragraphs in which the right place is assigned to Dryden, who, though he added hardly anything to epic theory, yet had something to say about the vexed problem of verisimilitude and the use of the marvellous, and greatly felt the constraint of some of the purely rationalistic theories of his day, and the sections concerning Blackmore, who was the last to revive the dead struggle over the Christian epic, are at once interesting and instructive.

It is these chapters that form the focus point of the book and are a valuable contribution to the history of the epic.

Haarlem.

F. P. VAN DER VOORDE.

---

*Lord Byrons Subjektivismus in seinem Verhalten zur Geschichte untersucht an seinen Verserzählungen.* Von HILDEGARD DÖRKEN. 110 pp. Leipzig, Bernhard Tauchnitz. 1929. (Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie, Heft XII). RM. 7.

This is a work of supererogation, for it attempts to establish a thesis that no-one has ever doubted, though perhaps it has never been stated so explicitly as Dr. Dörken states it here: viz. that Byron's poetry is essentially subjective, and that the tales in verse, no less than the lighter lyrical pieces, show the influence of his own mental state at the time when they were written. As the author herself expresses it on page 11 of her book, her object is "zu zeigen dass mehr als in einzelnen Aussagen die Subjektivität Byrons in dem Geist und in der ganzen Atmosphäre eines jeden Dichtwerkes sich offenbart." Taking nine poems<sup>1</sup> and examining them individually, she finds a subjective

---

<sup>1</sup> i.e. *The Siege of Corinth*, *Parisina*, *Mazeppa*, *The Prisoner of Chillon*, *The Giaour*, *The Bride of Abydos*, *The Corsair*, *Lara*, and *The Island*.

interpretation for each one, and attempts to show that its tone, its treatment, and even the choice of the story, was conditioned to a large extent by the circumstances of the author's life and by his experiences. Then in a final chapter she draws together the threads of her investigations, and comes to the satisfying conclusion that "es ist offensichtlich, dass für den Dichter Byron das persönliche Erlebnis das Primäre und Zentrale ist". (p. 106). Well, we cannot but nod assent, but it hardly needed some hundred and five pages of close print to prove this to us; it could have been done in far less space, for much of the material is obvious, and some of it seems unnecessarily laboured. As an advocate Dr. Dörken falls between two stools. On the one hand she has an annoying habit of advancing well-known facts with much pomp and ceremony as though they were new discoveries of hers; and on the other she tends to draw rather dogmatic conclusions from evidence which is not always convincing. Of course, the trouble with such a subject as she has set herself to write upon is that it so easily lends itself to imaginative treatment. With a little ingenuity (though, of course, with every intention of being honest) one can find a subjective interpretation for most poems, though whether it is the correct interpretation is open to question. Caution is always necessary in this line of approach to a poet, and caution is just what Dr. Dörken has failed to exercise.

Personally, the present writer feels that the best chapters in the book are the first two, in which the author subjects Byron's remarkable personality to a psychological analysis, and draws a contrast between Byron's and Scott's treatment of history in their works. The aristocratic outlook of the author of *Manfred*, his physical deformity, his treatment by society, his early experiences, and his relations with his friends, all these are touched upon and studied in the light of his personality. Perhaps it would have been more profitable if these introductory chapters had been elaborated at the expense of the remainder of the book.

It should be mentioned in conclusion that there is a good bibliography, which facilitates further study.

Sheffield,

FREDERICK T. WOOD.

---

### Brief Mention.

*England Muddles Through.* By H. E. SCARBOROUGH. Tauchnitz Edition, Vol. 5092. 268 pp. Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1933. M. 1.80.

It is but rarely possible for us to notice the well-known reprints of British and American authors published by the famous Leipzig firm. An exception must be made for this study of the English and their ways by the London correspondent of a great American newspaper, whose familiarity with England at the time of writing extended over a period of more than eleven years. The book has information as well as criticism to offer, and, while full of shrewd observation and comment, is written with none of Renier's conscious cleverness. Its tone also compares favourably with that of many supercilious English judgments of America.

It is a pity that the reliability of the Tauchnitz texts should be so frequently marred by serious misprints. The present volume has *report* for *retort* on p. 55, *but* for *bus* on p. 74, a comma which corrupts the meaning of a sentence on p. 77, l. 8, another on p. 121, l. 1, *damned* for *dammed* on p. 132, and *incidents* for *incidence* on p. 192; unfortunately, it is fully representative in this respect of the textual quality of the whole series, at least during the last ten years. It is only fair to say that its younger rival, the Albatross series, is incomparably worse. Students of modern English in quest of linguistic material will always do well to refer to the original, English or American, editions — R.W.Z.

---



# Bibliography.

## POETRY, FICTION, DRAMA.

*The Exeter Book of Old English Poetry.* With Introductory Chapters by R. W. CHAMBERS, MAX FÖRSTER and ROBIN FLOWER. 16 × 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ , 94 pp. and Collotype Facsimile of the Exeter Book. 260 pp. For the Dean and Chapter of Exeter Cathedral. Percy Lund, Humphries. £ 8 8s. net. [A review will appear.]

*The Paris Psalter and the Meters of Boethius.* Edited by GEORGE PHILIP KRAPP. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$  × 6, iv. + 239 pp. (The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records. A Collective Edition.) New York: Columbia University Press. London: Routledge. 18s. net.

*Three Northumbrian Poems. Caedmon's Hymn, Bede's Death Song and The Leiden Riddle.* Edited by A. H. SMITH, Ph.D. (Methuen's Old English Library. General Editors A. H. Smith, Ph.D., and F. Norman, M.A.) x. + 54 pp. London, Methuen, 1933. 2s. [A review will appear.]

*Deor.* Edited by KEMP MALONE. (Methuen's Old English Library. General Editors: A. H. Smith and F. Norman.) x. + 38 pp. London, Methuen, 1933. 1/6 net. [A review will appear.]

*English Lyrics of the XIII. Century.* Edited by CARLETON BROWN. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$  × 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ , xliii. + 312 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 10s. 6d. net.

*The Pearl.* The Fourteenth Century English Poem Rendered in Modern Verse. With an Introductory Essay by STANLEY PERKINS CHASE. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$  × 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ , lxiii. + 110 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 10s. 6d. net.

*The Pearl.* (The Bowdoin Edition.) The Text of the Fourteenth Century English Poem. Edited by Members of the Chaucer Course (English 21-22) in Bowdoin College. 7 × 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ , ix. + 84 pp. Boston: Bruce Humphries Inc. London: C. W. Daniël. 5s. net.

*Six Centuries of English Literature.* Passages Selected from the Chief Writers and Short Biographies. By RICHARD FERRAR PATTERSON. In Six Volumes. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$  × 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ . Volume I. *Chaucer to Spenser.* With Introductory Essay by W. L. RENWICK. xxv. + 383 pp. Volume II. *Lyly to Shirley.* With Introductory Essay by PETER ALEXANDER. xxvi. + 383 pp. Volume III. *Herrick to Locke.* With Introductory Essay by L. C. MARTIN. xxvi. + 383 pp. Volume IV. *Prior to Rogers.* With Introductory Essay by STEPHEN GWYNN. xxv. + 384 pp. Volume V. *Wordsworth to Trollope.* With Introductory Essay by EMILE LEGOUIS. xxvi. + 384 pp. Volume VI. *Meredith to Rupert Brooke.* With Introductory Essay by G. K. CHESTERTON. xxvi. + 392 pp. Blackie. 12s. 6d. n. each volume.

*The Siege of Jerusalem.* Edited from MS. Laud. Misc. 656 with variants from: all other extant MSS. By E. KÖLBING and MABEL DAY. [E. E. T. S., Original Series, No. 188. 1932 (for 1931).] xxxi. + 133 pp. London, Milford, 1932, (publ. 5 Jan. 1933.) 15/- net. [A review will appear.]

*The Poems of William Dunbar.* Edited by W. MACKAY MACKENZIE. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$  × 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ , xxxix. + 272 pp. Edinburgh: Porpoise Press. 12s. 6d. net.

## LANGUAGE.

*Altenglisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch.* Von F. HOLTHAUSEN. 1—5. Lieferung. 1—400 pp. [Germ. Bibliothek, begr. von W. Streitberg. N. Reihe: Wörterbücher. 7.] Heidelberg, Winter, 1932—1933. RM. 3.—. each part. [See Review, April 1933.]

*Vollständiges Wörterbuch zur sog. Caedmonschen Genesis.* Von TH. BRAASCH. (Angl. Forschungen, 76.) VII + 157 pp. Heidelberg, Winter, 1933. RM. 10.—. [A review will appear.]

*Lautlehre der ae. Hexameron-Homilie des Abtes Ælfric.* Von TH. GÖHLER. 182 pp. Leipzig, Author. 1933. [A review will appear.]

Diss. Munich.

*Zu altenglischen Interlinearversionen von Prosaparaphrasen latein. Hymnen.* Von H. KLAPPENBACH. 8<sup>o</sup> 167 pp. Phil. Diss. Leipzig 1930.

*A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue.* From the Twelfth Century to the End of the Seventeenth. By SIR WILLIAM A. CRAIGIE. Part. II., Assembling-Berising. 12 $\frac{1}{4}$  × 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ . pp. 121—240. Chicago: University Press. London: Milford. 21s. n. each part.

*Studien zur syntaktischen und stilistischen Funktion des Adverbs bei Chaucer und im Rosenroman.* Von H. HEUER. VII + 168 pp. [Anglistische Forschungen, 75.] Heidelberg, Winter, 1932. RM. 7.50. [A review will appear.]

*Grundzüge der Syntax der mittellenglischen Stabreimdichtungen.* Von H. KOZIOL. (Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, LVIII.) XVI + 172 pp. Wien, Braumüller, 1932. RM. 8.—. [A review will appear.]

*Some Facts Concerning the Syntax of Malory's Morte Darthur.* By A. DEKKER. 205 pp. Amsterdam, 1932.

Diss. Amsterdam.

*Select Studies in Colloquial English of the Late Middle Ages.* By G. LANGENFELT. XXVII + 129 pp. Lund, Gleerupska Univ.-Bokhandeln, 1933. Price 7 kr. [A review will appear.]

*The Booke of The Common Prayer, 1549.* An enquiry into its language (phonology and accidence), with an introductory note about its composition and origin. By A. A. PRINS. XXI + 129 pp. Amsterdam, Drukkerij Portielje, 1933.

Diss. Amsterdam.

*The Place-Names of Devon.* By J. E. B. GOVER, A. MAWER and F. M. STENTON. Part. I. ix. + 334 pp. Part. II. xiv. + pp. 335-754. 9 × 6. (English Place-Name Society. Vol. VIII. and Vol. IX.) Cambridge University Press. 1932. 40s. n. the Two Volumes and Maps. [A review will appear.]

*The Place-Names of Northamptonshire.* By J. E. B. GOVER, A. MAWER and F. M. STENTON. (English Place-Name Society, Vol. X.) iii. + 311 pp. Cambridge University Press, 1933. 18/— net. [A review will appear.]

*English Place-Name Puzzles.* A methodical investigation into the question of personal names or descriptive words in English place-names. By R. E. ZACHRISSON. 69 pp. Uppsala, A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1932. Price 3.50 Sw. kronor. [A review will appear.]

*The Beginnings of American English.* Essays and Comments. Edited by M. M. MATHEWS. 8¾ × 5¼, x. + 181 pp. Chicago: University Press. London: Cambridge University Press. 12s. 6d. net.

*A Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary.* By J. F. BENSE. Part. III: Keelful-Plash. I—III, 161—288 pp. The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, 1932. Price 6 guilders. Milford, 16s. net. [A review will appear.]

*A Survey of English Dictionaries.* By M. M. MATHEWS. 123 pp. Oxford University Press. London: Milford, 1933. 5s. net. [A review will appear.]

*The Universal Dictionary of the English Language.* A new and original compilation giving all pronunciations in simplified and in more exact phonetic notations, extensive etymologies, definitions, the latest accepted words in scientific, technical, and general use, with copious illustrative phrases and colloquialisms. Edited by HENRY CECIL WILD, B.Litt., M.A., Merton Professor of English Language and Literature, 11¾ × 9¾, xx. + 1431 pp. Routledge. 42s. net. [See Review, Febr. 1933.]

*The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles.* Prepared by WILLIAM LITTLE, H. W. FOWLER, and J. COULSON. Revised and Edited by C. T. ONIONS. In Two Volumes. 11 × 8¼. Vol. I., A-M, xxi. + 1306 pp. Vol. II., N-Z, viii. + 1307—2475 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 63s. the two volumes. [See Review, June, 1933.]

*Engelsch Woordenboek.* Door A. E. H. SWAEN. Eerste deel: Engelsch-Nederlandsch, pp. I—VII; columns 1—2090; pp. 2091—2118. Zutphen, W. J. Thieme & Cie., 1933. Fl. 7.50. [A review will appear.]

*Some Aspects of the Diction of English Poetry.* Three Lectures delivered before the University of London during February, 1933, at Westfield College. By HENRY CECIL WYLD. 8½ × 5½, 72 pp. Oxford: Blackwell. 2s. 6d. net.

*The Theory of Speech and Language.* By ALAN H. GARDINER. 9 × 6, x. + 332 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 10s. 6d. net. [A review will appear.]

*A Grammar of the English Language.* In three volumes. Vol. III. *Syntax.* By G. O. CURME. XV + 616 pp. New York, D. C. Heath & Cy. 1931. \$ 5.—. [A review will appear.]

*A Modern English Grammar on historical principles.* P. IV. By O. JESPERSEN. 80 pp. 400. Heidelberg: Winter 1931. German. Bibl. Abt. I. Reihe I. Bd. 9. 11.50 RM. [A review will appear.]

*The System of Grammar.* By O. JESPERSEN. 46 pp. Copenhagen, Levin & Munksgaard. London, Allen & Unwin, 1933. Price ? [A review will appear.]

*Essentials of English Grammar.* By O. JESPERSEN. 387 pp. London, Allen & Unwin, 1933. 8s. 6d. net. [A review will appear.]

*Standard English Speech.* A Compendium of English Phonetics for Foreign Students. By G. E. FUHRKEN. 7<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> × 5, viii + 121 pp. Cambridge University Press. 5s. net. [See Review, Aug. 1932.]

*An Outline of English Phonetics.* By DANIEL JONES. (Third Edition, Rewritten.) 8<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> × 5<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>, x. + 326 pp. Cambridge: Heffer. 12s. 6d. net. Leipzig, Teubner, 1932. RM. 7.80. [See Review, Febr. 1933.]

*Englische Phonetik mit Lesestücken.* Von A. C. DUNSTAN. 2. Aufl. bes. v. M. Kaluza. Verbess. Neudruck. 8<sup>o</sup> 125 pp. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1931. Sig. Göschen 601. RM. 1.80.

*Lebendige Sprache. Fortsetzung: Oszillographische Forschungen zum Wesen des Akzents.* Von A. BRANDL und R. TOURBIER. Mit 3 Tafeln. (Sonderausgabe aus den Sitzungsberichten der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse. 1931. XXXII.) 109 pp. Berlin, Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1931. RM. 10.—

*The Life of Joseph Wright.* By ELIZABETH MARY WRIGHT. In Two Volumes. 10 × 7. Vol. I. xii. + 348 pp. and xiv. plates. Vol. II. pp. 349-710 and plates xv.-xxxv. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 30s. n. the two volumes. [A review will appear.]

*Charisteria Gulielmo Mathesio Quinquagenario.* A Discipulis et Circuli Linguistici Pragensis Sodalibus Oblata. 147 pp. Prague, Cercle Linguistique, 1932. Leipzig, Harrassowitz, RM. 6.—. [A review will appear.]

*The Phonology of the Suffolk Dialect, descriptive and historical.* By H. KÖKERITZ. (Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift, 1932.) XXIII + 328 pp. Uppsala, A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1932. 11 kr. [A review will appear.]

*A Grammar of the Buchan Dialect.* (Aberdeenshire.) Descriptive and Historical. Vol. I., Phonology-Accidence. By EUGEN DIETH. 8<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> × 5<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, xxii. + 213 pp. Cambridge: Heffer. 12s. 6d. net.

*"Oxford" English.* By R. W. CHAPMAN. 9 × 6, pp. 539-563. (S. P. E. Tract No. XXXVII.) Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 2s. 6d. net.

*Neuenglische Stilistik.* Von M. DEUTSCHBEIN. XII + 187 pp. Leipzig, Quelle u. Meyer, 1932. Geb. RM. 5.—. [See Review, June 1933.]

*A Dictionary of English Style.* Publ., with the coop. of A. H. J. KNIGHT, by A. REUM. P. III. gr. 8<sup>o</sup> pp. 771. Leipzig: Weber 1931.

*Stil und Sprache in den Erzählungen Barries.* Von L. LOTZE. Gr. 8<sup>o</sup> 130 pp. Phil. Diss. Halle, 1931.

*Die Sprache Virginia Woolfs.* Ein Beitrag zur Stilistik des modernen englischen Romans. Von J. BADENHAUSEN. 63 pp. Marburg, Ebel, 1932. RM. 1.50. [A review will appear.]

*A Study of English Word-Values, statistically determined from the latest extensive word-counts* by L. FAUCETT and ITSU MAKI. ii. + 12 + 252 + 12 pp. Tokyo, Matsumura Sanshodo; London, Milford, 1932. 3/6 net.

*Die Bezeichnung der Kausativen Funktion im Neuenglischen.* Von E. PERL. Gr. 8<sup>o</sup> pp. 154. Breslau: Priebatsch, 1931. Sprache und Kultur d. germ.-roman. Völker. A. Bd. 9. 4.50 RM.

*Soziologische Studien zur Neuenglischen Syntax.* Von W. VOLCKMAR. 8<sup>o</sup> 75 pp. Phil. Diss., Jena, 1930.

*Amelioratives in English.* I. By G. A. VAN DONGEN. 152 pp. Rotterdam, T. de Vries Dzn. 1933. Diss. Amsterdam.

*The Proverb.* By ARCHER TAYLOR. 8 × 5<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, xi. + 223 pp. Harvard University Press. London: Milford. 11s. 6d. net.

## HISTORY.

*Die Anfänge des Puritanismus.* Versuch einer Deutung der englischen Reformation. Von H. SCHÖFFLER. [Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten, 14.] 177 pp. Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1932. RM. 5.—. [A review will appear.]

*The Life and Times of Anthony à Wood.* Abridged from Andrew Clark's Edition and with an introduction by LLEWELYN POWYS. 9 × 6, xix. + 319 pp. Wishart. 15s. net.



*Sozialismus und Religion.* Konfessionssoziologische Untersuchung der Labour Party 1929-1931. Von F. LINDEN. (Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten, 17. Band.) 178 pp. Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1932. RM. 9.—.

*Die Stellung der Dominien im Verfassungssystem des Britischen Reiches im Jahre 1931.* Von H. WALTER. 99 pp. Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1932. Geb. RM. 4.50. [A review will appear.]

*Die politische Schulung des englischen Volkes.* Von H. SCHÖFFLER. 8<sup>o</sup> 38 pp. Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1931. Hefte zur Englandkunde. H. 5. RM. 1.25.

*England Muddles Through.* By H. E. SCARBOROUGH. (Tauchnitz Edition, no. 5092.) 268 pp. Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1933. M. 1.80. [See Brief Mention.]

*Dictionary of American Biography.* Under the Auspices of the American Council of Learned Societies. Edited by DUMAS MALONE. Vol. III. GRINNEL-HIBBARD. ix. + 612 pp. Vol. IX. HIBBEN-JARVIS. x. + 625 pp., 10 × 7<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>. Vol. X. JASPER-LARKIN. x. + 617 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 52 s. 6 d. net each. Set of twenty volumes 45 guineas.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY.

*Fifth Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050-1400.* Additions and Modifications to July, 1932. By JOHN EDWIN WELLS. 9 × 6, pp. 1337-1432. For the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Milford. 8 s. 6 d. net.

*A Bibliography of Dr. John Donne.* By GEOFFREY KEYNES. Second Edition. 10<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> × 7<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, xvi. + 195 pp. Cambridge University Press, 1932. 52 s. 6 d. n. [A review will appear.]

*Increase Mather.* A Bibliography of his Works. By THOMAS JAMES HOLMES. With an Introduction by GEORGE PARKER WINSHIP and Supplementary Material by KENNETH BALLARD MURDOCK and GEORGE FRANCIS DOW. In Two Volumes. 9 × 6<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>. Vol. I., xxxii. + 352 pp. Vol. II., pp. 353-711. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. London: Milford. 105 s. net.

*A Bibliography of the Writings of William Somerset Maugham.* Compiled by FREDERICK T. BASON. 9 × 6, 78 pp. Unicorn Press. 10 s. 6 d. net.

*Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous English Literature* (Samuel Halkett and John Laing). New and Enlarged Edition. By DR. JAMES KENNEDY, W. A. SMITH, and A. F. JOHNSON. Vol. VI. 10<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> × 7<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, 449 pp. Oliver and Boyd. 36 s. net each volume. Sold in complete sets only.

*A Guide to the Best Fiction, English and American, including Translations from Foreign Languages.* By ERNEST A. BAKER and JAMES PACKMAN. New and Enlarged Edition. 11<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> × 9<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>, viii. + 634 pp. Routledge. 42 s. net. [A review will appear.]

*Jahresberichte über die Erscheinen auf d. Geb. der german. Philologie.* Jg. 51. N. F. 9. Bibliogr. 1929. 8<sup>o</sup> pp. 350. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1931.

*The Year's Work in English Studies.* Vol. XI., 1930. Edited for the English Association by F. S. BOAS. 9 × 6, 400 pp. Vol. XII., 1931. Edited by F. S. BOAS and M. S. SERJEANTSON. 342 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 10 s. 6 d. net. Members, 3 s. 6 d. net. [A review will appear.]

*Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature.* Vol. XII. 1931. Edited for the Modern Humanities Research Association by MARY S. SERJEANTSON. IX + 272 pp. Cambridge, Bowes & Bowes, 1932. 7 s. 6 d. net. [A review will appear.]

*Doctoral Dissertations in American Literature.* Compiled by E. E. LEISY and J. B. HUBBELL. Reprinted from *American Literature*, IV, 4. 419-465 pp. Duke University Press. 1933. 50 cents.

*Englische und amerikanische Sprache und Literatur.* Von E. MÜHLBACH. Jahresberichte des Literar. Zentralblatts für Deutschland, VII. Leipzig, 1931. pp. 461-478.

SCHÜCKING, L. L. & W. EBISCH: *Grundlinien einer Bibliographie zum Studium der englischen Philologie.* Als Ms. gedr. 8<sup>o</sup> 24 pp. Leipzig: Haberland, 1931.

*Ratgeber für das Studium der Anglistik.* Von W. EBISCH. 8<sup>o</sup> 13 pp. Leipzig: Lorentz, 1931. Leipziger Hochschulhefte 1. RM. 0.50.

## The Evolution of nasal a in Anglo-Norman and in English.

Like English, Dutch and German have taken over a number of words containing a + nasal consonant from French. In borrowing such words Dutch and German have simply denasalized the *ā*, the result being that Dutch has oral *a* in *kamp* (Eng. 'camp'), *lamp*, *kandelaar*, *kandij*, *warande*, *flank*, *dans*, *dansen*, *kans*, *lans*, *trans*, *diamant*, *hanteeren*, *kanteel*, *klant*, *tante*, *rantsoen*, *franje*, *kastanje*, *oranje*; German has the same vowel in *Lampe*, *Flanke*, *Tanz*, *tanzen*, *Schanz(e)*, *Lanze*, *Diamant*, *hantieren*, *ranzig*, *Franze*, *Tante*. Similarly words that English has recently borrowed from French, generally have *-am-*, *-an-*, as *ampere* (*ammeter*), *champagne*, *flambeau*, *banderole*, *chandelier*, *mansard*, *pansy*, *portmanteau*, *tangerine*. Probably the way these words are pronounced in English is in some measure due to the spelling. This is a factor that has always to be reckoned with in the case of late borrowings.

In Middle and in Early Modern English practically all the words under discussion were spelt in two ways: *chamber* and *chaumber*, *command* and *commaund*, *change* and *chaunge*, *frank* and *fraunk*, etc. In several cases these orthographic doublets remained in use until about the end of the eighteenth century, and even at the present time we have *lance* (a weapon) and *launce*, 'sand-eel', *to lance* and *to launch*, *sanders* and *saunders*, 'sandal-wood', *stanch* and *staunch*, *Sander*, *Sanders*, *Sanderson* and *Saunder*, *Saunders*, *Saunderson*.

That *-am-* and *-aum-*, *-an-* and *-aun-* were not merely variant spellings need not be insisted upon; in the light of the phonetic history of the words concerned it may *a priori* be taken for granted, that the double spelling was intended to denote a twofold pronunciation.

The words that form the subject of the present investigation were partly borrowed twice from Anglo-Norman, first in an early form, and subsequently again in a later one. In this respect they do not constitute a unique group; there are several other words that occur in Middle English in two, or even in three, different forms, owing to phonetic changes that took place in Anglo-Norman. Here are a few instances: *cariteþ*—*charitee*; *cuntreþ*—*cuntree*; *deintep*—*deintee*; *feib*—*fei*; *nativiteþ*—*nativitee*; *plentep*—*plentee*; — *perfit*—*parfit*; *persone*—*parson*; *sermon*—*sarmon*; *serv(i)en*—*sarv(i)en*; — *i(s)le*—*idle*, *ilde*, 'island'; — *deis*, *dais*—*dees*; *aise*, *eise*—*ese*; *pais*—*pees*; *plaiden*—*pled*; *raison*, *reison*—*reson*; *saisen*, *seizen*—*sezen*; — *foison*—*fuison*—*fuson*; *poison*—*puison*—*puson*; *soilen*—*suilen*—*sulen*; *spoil*—*spuilen*—*spulen*, etc. Modern English still has *faith* and *fay*, *to coil* and *to cull*. Standard English has *poison* and other *-oi-* words, but many dialects have [paɪn] < *puison*, and a few have [pʊzn], [pɒzn] < *puson*. In the case of *to seize* (*seizin*, *seizure*) the spelling of the oldest form has been preserved, while the pronunciation has developed from M.E. *sēzen*. M.E. *persone* and *parson* were used indiscriminately; the modern form *person* may represent M.E. *persone*, but this is far from certain.

"For reasons still imperfectly known, it (scil. Anglo-Norman) changed somewhat more rapidly than the dialects on the Continent. This was due, in some measure at least, to the constant contact with another language"<sup>1</sup>. Studer does not elaborate this remark. He might have added that certain phonetic phenomena are common to early Middle English and Anglo-Norman, and that a few sound changes in Anglo-Norman are probably due to English influence.

In the twelfth century *ai* and *ei* began to be confused in Anglo-Norman<sup>2</sup>. A similar process took place in early Middle English. According to Jordan<sup>3</sup> *ei* became *æi* and then *ai* in the second half of the thirteenth century. In some areas the confusion seems to have set in more than a century earlier. This is the conclusion we are bound to draw from a considerable number of spellings in the *Peterborough Chronicle* — if spellings mean anything at all. The following spellings are certainly highly suggestive.

*dei*, 1132, 1135; *dæi*, 852, 1128, 1131 (3 times), etc.; *dæies* (gen.) 1129, 1131, 1140; *dæies* (pl.), 1137; *dæis* (pl.), 1137 (twice), 1154; *daies* (gen.), 1128; *eie* 'awe', 1154; *æie*, 1135; *læi* (pret.), 1127; *lai* 1137; *leide* (pret.), 1123; *leidon*, 656; *læide*, 1140; *læiden*, 1137; *mæi*, 1170; *mai* 1137; *sei* (inf.), 1135, 1154; *seib*, 656, 1130; *seide*, 675, 1128, 1130, etc.; *seidon*, 1127; *sæin* (inf.), 1137; *sæide*, 963, 1127, 1131; *sæidon*, 1124; *reilþein*, O.E. *hræglþegn*, 1131.

The scribes of the *Peterborough Chronicle* evidently used *ei*, *æi*, and *ai* indiscriminately, and the three symbols must have represented the same, or approximately the same, diphthong.

Jordan states, *l.c.*, that the earliest evidence of the coalescence of *ei* and *ai* is found in the rhyme *way : day* in the *Debate of Body and Soul* (second half of the thirteenth century). The same rhyme occurs six times in *Genesis and Exodus* (first half of the thirteenth century), namely in l. 615 f., 861 f., 1429 f., 1744 f., 2305 f., 3641 f..

I am inclined to think that the coalescence of *ei* and *ai* took place in Anglo-Norman at the same time as in English.

Both Middle English and Anglo-Norman had an [ö:] sound in the twelfth century; M.E. [ö:] had developed from O.E. *eo* (*deop*, *þeof*, etc.), A.N. [ö:] from *ue* (*cuer*, *pueple*, etc.). The unrounding of this sound to *ē* began about the same time in English and in Anglo-Norman. The first *e*-spellings in English are found in the *Peterborough Chronicle*; Orm probably pronounced *ē*, but may have known the older pronunciation as well. In Anglo-Norman MSS. *e*-spellings first occur in the beginning of the thirteenth century<sup>4</sup>; in later MSS. forms like *beef*, *mevable*, *neef* 'new', *peple*, *qer* 'heart,' etc. are quite usual. As the provenance of Anglo-Norman MSS. is mostly unknown, it is impossible to say whether the unrounding of both [ö:]s began in the same area.

Although tradition played a great part in Anglo-Norman orthography, the fact that for two centuries after the appearance of *e* spellings, the symbols for the rounded vowel, viz. *ue*, *eu*, *oe*, *eo*, *o*, *u*, continued to be used, renders it highly probable that there were areas where not only M.E. [ö:], but also Anglo-Norman [ö:] remained unchanged, or at any rate, preserved its rounded

<sup>1</sup> Studer, *The Study of Anglo-Norman*. Inaugural Lecture. Oxford 1920, p. 9 f.

<sup>2</sup> Vising, *Anglo-Norman Language and Literature*, 29.4.

<sup>3</sup> *Handbuch der mittellenglischen Grammatik*, § 95.

<sup>4</sup> Stimming, *Boeve de Haumtone*, p. 208.



character. It is significant that the symbols employed are the same in the two languages; English borrowed *ue*, *eu*, *oe*, *o*, and *u* from Anglo-Norman, while, conversely, Anglo-Norman took over *eo* from English.

Old French had *leu*, *mileu*, *reule*, *Andreu*, *Deu*, *Greu*, *Mattheu*, etc. by the side of *lieu*, *liu*, *rieule*, *riule*, *Andrieu*, *Dieu*, *Grieu*, *Matthieu*, etc.. The triphthong *ieu* and the diphthong *iu* were unknown in early Middle English, which, however, had *ēu-* (*blew*, *newe*, etc.), and it is, therefore, not owing to a specific Anglo-Norman sound development that the *ieu-*, *iu-*forms, which are found in early Anglo-Norman, too, gradually had to abandon the field to the *eu*-forms. Early Anglo-Norman has *siwere*, 'follow', (O.F. has forms like *sieu*, *sienent* in the paradigm of *suivre*), but the form that found its way into English (M.E. *sewe(n)*) was *sewere*; cf. also A.N. *trewes*, *triewes* (always plural), O.F. *trieue*, *triewe*, 'truce'.

That Middle English had no *eau*-triphthong, but only the diphthong *ēu* (*dew*, *fewe*, etc.) is no doubt also the reason why Anglo-Norman discarded *eawe*, and preserved *ewe*, *ewere* (O.F. *eaue* and *ewe*, 'water'). Similarly Anglo-Norman has *eu* for *eau* < *el* before a consonant: *beute*, *peus*, 'skins', *teus* (plur. of *tel*), and hence *teu*; *queus* (plur. of *quel*), and hence *queu* and even *queul*, *peutre*, *leument*, 'loyally', *crueus* (plur. of *cruel*). In the *Miracles de la Seinte Vierge* we find *erreument*, 'quickly', IV. 159, and *erealment* XLVII. 46.

The estimates of the number of Normans who came over to England during and after the Conquest, vary considerably; still it is quite certain that these immigrants always formed a minority, probably only a comparatively small minority, of the population of the country. It is quite possible that many of them may never have taken the trouble to learn English; others, especially the numerous traders and handicraftsmen, who had settled in London, the market towns, and the seaports, were in constant intercourse with the native population, and could not fail to pick up some English; in fact they could hardly have got along without acquiring a smattering of the language of those upon whom they largely depended for a living. Conversely, the Englishmen who traded with them, or were their customers, would naturally enrich their vocabulary with a few Norman words. It seems unlikely that all these Norman traders and artisans had French wives. Many of them no doubt married English women, and their children would of course be more or less bilingual.

And where did the wives of the five thousand knights whom the Conqueror provided with fiefs, hail from? Some may, after the Conquest, have been joined by their wives, who had remained behind in Normandy. Others may, with the king's permission, have taken a trip across the Channel expressly for matrimonial purposes; others, again, may have asked friends or acquaintances in the home country to send their daughters to England; — the young ladies themselves had no say in such matters. But many would look out for wives in their new country. "In some cases the new landowner married the former landowner's daughter, or his widow, but this was not by any means the usual case"<sup>1</sup>. The large households of these new landowners cannot have consisted exclusively of Normans. To assume that the children who grew up in these households in the latter part of the eleventh century, only learned French, and remained absolutely ignorant of English, even if both parents had come from

<sup>1</sup> York Powel, in *The Building of Britain and the Empire*, Illustrated Edition, Vol. I, p. 346.

over the sea, amounts to ignoring the social conditions of the time, and the daily life at the manor house.

The spread of English among the Normans, and of French among the English was far more rapid than was generally postulated until comparatively recently. "Popular fallacies die hard. It is a familiar legend of our childhood that at least well into the thirteenth century, Normans and Saxons dwelt side by side, but perfectly distinct."<sup>1</sup> The truth, established by modern investigation is, according to Studer<sup>2</sup>, "By the thirteenth century most of the Norman English and many of the Saxon English were bilingual, but the contention of Schreibner that 'to both classes of the population French was now an acquired language', is not supported by facts."

The word 'bilingual' must not be taken too literally. There were doubtless many people who had a perfect command of one language, and only a working knowledge of the other. To the 'Saxon English' Anglo-Norman was probably often, if not mostly, an acquired language. Now it is a well-known fact that people who have learned a foreign language that is, phonetically, widely different from their own, without any training in sound production, who have 'picked it up by the wayside', often make a sad mess of the pronunciation. This is frequently the case even with people who have acquired a foreign language under the most favourable circumstances. They try to imitate the unfamiliar foreign sounds to the best of their ability, but their attempts often end in their simply substituting for them sounds they have been familiar with from the cradle.<sup>3</sup>

English has never had any nasal vowels, and the eleventh and twelfth century Englishman must have found the French nasal vowels as difficult to master as the English schoolboy does at the present day. As long as only a comparatively small number of people struggled with them, their mistakes would not influence the current pronunciation of Anglo-Norman. But when constantly increasing numbers of Englishmen "wolde lykne ham sylf to gentil men & fonded wiþ gret bysynes for to speke Freynsch, for to be more ytold of," their shortcomings would, perhaps slowly, but surely all the same, affect Anglo-Norman pronunciation.

Modern French nasal a generally sounds to an Englishman as if it was tintured with [ɔ], and many English people think they are doing ample justice to it, if they pronounce it like [ɔŋ], [ɔ:n] or [ɔŋ], [ɔ:n].

We shall never know how the Anglo-Normans pronounced *ā* in the eleventh and the twelfth century, though it is possible to make a guess. In this connection it may help us to know what impression French *a* made upon a cultured Englishman at the beginning of the sixteenth century. I am alluding

<sup>1</sup> Medley, in *The Building of Britain and the Empire*, Illustrated Edition, Vol. I, p. 532.

<sup>2</sup> l.c. p. 10.

<sup>3</sup> With apologies to Prof. Wyld I take the liberty of copying part of § 71 of his *Short History of English*, 3rd. ed., in which the effect of bilingualism upon the two languages concerned is discussed.

"The result of this intimate association upon pronunciation is that one language is spoken with a 'foreign accent,' so that many or all the characteristic sounds of a language are given up in favour of those in the other which most closely resemble them. In many districts of Wales, where English has been spoken for generations alongside of Welsh, the English pronunciation is as foreign as that of a German or a Frenchman, and although there is extraordinary fluency and volubility, and even considerable 'correctness' in Grammar and Syntax, the sentence stress, the intonation, and all the sounds are purely Welsh and un-English.

Some such fate as this probably overtook Norman French as spoken in this country, some time before it died out."

to Palsgrave, who in 1530 published his *Esclaircissement de la langue Francoyse*, from which the following passages have been copied.<sup>1</sup>

"Where as I have said that ... they make a maner of modulation inwardly, that thyng happeneth in the soundyng of thre of theyr vowelles onely, A, E and O, and that nat universally, but onely so often as they come before M or N in one syllable, or when E is in the last syllable<sup>2</sup> ... so that these three letters M, N or E fynall, nat havynge the accent upon hym, be the very and onely causes why these thre vowelles A, E, O, be formed in the brest and sounded by the nose. And for so moche as of necessity, to forme the different sounde of those thre vowelles they must nedes, at theyr fyrst formyng open theyr mouth more or lesse, yet whan the vowel ones formed in the brest ascendeth upwardes and must have M or N sounded with hym, they bryng theyr chawes togetherwardes agayne, and, in so doying, they seme to sound an V, and make in maner of A and O, diphthongs, whiche happeneth by rayson of cloyng of theyr mouth agayne, to come to the places where M and N be formed" (Brefe Introduction, p. XVI f.).

"Whan soever m or n folowe next after any of these II vowelles a or o both in one syllable, than shall the reder sounde an u betwene the said vowelles and m and n as though the vowell were a diphthonge, as *ambre*, *fant*, *nom*, *mon* shalbe sounded *aumbre*, *taunt*, *noum*, *moun*, accordyng as I have shewed here before ..." (Cap. VIII, p. 9).

Palsgrave's voluminous work is one of the books I often take up in a spare hour. There is so much useful information in it. Palsgrave knows what he is writing about. His reliability in matters of pronunciation, especially his ability to distinguish between a diphthong and a digraph has been called in question. I hope I shall not be suspected of cherishing the kind of sentiment an Englishman was voicing when he said, "I am sorry for the devil<sup>3</sup>; he is always abused; no one ever has a kind word for him." When Palsgrave endeavours in his quaint way to explain how French nasal vowels are pronounced, he does his best to 'analyze' them, as the modern phonetician would say. He learned his French in Paris, and when he set out to give his countrymen a few hints on French pronunciation, all he could do was to describe the impression the French sounds made on his ear. It seems unfair to doubt his reliability, when he states that in pronouncing *an* a Frenchman introduces a *u* between *a* and *n*. The point is not how *an* was actually pronounced in Paris, but what Palsgrave honestly thought he heard. It is not at all impossible that he pronounced [au] himself.

If Palsgrave thought a Frenchman seemed to sound a *u* after the *a*, Parisian *ā* probably struck him very much the same way as Anglo-Norman *ā* did the twelfth-century Englishman. Largely owing to English influence Anglo-Norman *ān* was denasalized, and *aun* was substituted for it. An unfamiliar sound, which was difficult to imitate, was replaced by the English diphthong *au*, which also occurred before *n*.

According to Vising *aun* for *an* is found from the beginning of the thirteenth century<sup>4</sup>. The oldest text in which I have found *aun*- spellings is the *First Anglo-Norman Prose Lapidary*<sup>5</sup>, the MS. of which 'is in an Anglo-

<sup>1</sup> I, of course, quote from Génin's reprint, Paris 1852.

<sup>2</sup> Words like *femme*, *mienne*, etc. are meant; cf. Cap. III, p. 3.

<sup>3</sup> He did not mean Palsgrave!

<sup>4</sup> Vising, *l.c.*, p. 29.7.

<sup>5</sup> Edited by Studer and Joan Evans in *Anglo-Norman Lapidaries*, Paris 1924. Vising refers to an article by himself in *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der rom. Phil.* XII. I. 211, which I have not been able to consult. As the example given by Vising is *enchautement*, it seems possible that his paper may deal with the *First Prose Lapidary*, which text has also been published in *Romania* XXXVIII.



Norman hand of the beginning of the thirteenth century.' <sup>1</sup> There are twenty-six *aun* spellings in this comparatively short text, viz. *enchauement*, *braunches*, *braunchete*, *resplendissaunts* and several other participles in *aunt*, *aunz*, etc., *blaunc*, *blanches*, *blaunchur*, *aungles*, *aunz*, 'years', *taunt*, *enfaunt*, *devaunt*, *enfaunter*, *saunc*. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries *au* spellings were much in vogue; still they never entirely supplanted the older *an* spellings, and in many texts both *an* and *aun* are found. Towards the end of the fourteenth century *au* spellings became less usual again. By that time Anglo-Norman had become, or was rapidly becoming, a dead language, and henceforward those who wrote 'French' were guided by continental French orthography in matters of spelling, although the traditional Anglo-Norman spelling was a considerable time dying. On going through a few documents, nearly all of them 'given' at Westminster from 1430 to 1452, and printed in Rymer's *Fœdera*, vols. X and XI, I have noted one or more, sometimes several, *aun*-spellings in nearly all of them.

When people who habitually spoke Anglo-Norman used English words, they, of course, anglo-normanized them. Place names had to be pronounced and written very frequently, and it is well-known that many an English place name would be different from what it is nowadays, if it had not been subject to Anglo-Norman influence. The Anglo-Normans replaced English *an* by *ā*, and this *ā* shared the change every *ā* underwent. This accounts for spellings like

- Baumborge*, 'Bamborough,' Langtoft I. 420; *Baumburgh* Rymer V. 838.  
*Caunterbire* (-bire), *Registrum Epist.* J. Peckham I. LXI; I. CXXVIII;  
 I. CXLIX, etc.; Langtoft, II, 26, 38, 124, etc.; *Literæ Cantuarienses* II,  
 56 (bis), II, 60, etc. (very frequently).  
*Cauntorbirie*, Liv. de Reis, 34.3.  
*Caunterbury* (-e), *French Chron. of London*, pp. 16, 21, etc.  
*Kaunterbyre*, Langt. II, 4.  
*Cauntebrigge*, *French Chron. of L.*, p. 85.  
*Estaungle*, 'East Anglia,' Langt. I, 368.  
*Haumtone*, Boeve de H., B, 3, 10, 80, etc. (frequently).  
*Nor(t)haumto(u)n*, Langt., I, 234, 364, 422, etc.  
*Mauncestre*, 'Manchester,' Langt. I, 282, 332.  
*Staunford(e)*, 'Stamford,' Rymer III, 150, 153, 155, 156, etc. *Lib.*  
*Albus*, 545.  
*Staunforbrige*, Langt., I, 400.  
*Estaunford*, Rymer II, 151, 469.  
*Thauncastre*, 'Thangcaster,' Langt., I, 102.

In all these forms *aun* represents English *ǣn*. But how are we to interpret *-laund* in place names? Langtoft was a Northerner, and his *-laund*, of course, stands for Northern *-lānd*, as in *Irlaunde* I, 124, 126, 158 (bis), 180, etc. (but *Irlande*, I, 126); *Westmerlaunde*, I, 94 (but *Westmerland*, I, 78); *Hoylaunders*, 'Hollanders,' II, 230. Archbishop Peckham, however, was a Southerner, an Englishman, born in Sussex <sup>2</sup>, and he did not pronounce [lānd], but [lɔ:nd]. Yet, in his letters to Edward I Frere Jehan mostly addresses the king as *seignur de (d') Irlaunde*, Nos. CXLIX, CCLIIVIII, etc.; and Queen Eleanor he styles *dame d'Irlaunde*, Nos. CCCCXXIX and CCCCLXXXIV, although in the earlier letters *Irlande* is also found, and in two of the later ones, too, *Yrlande* occurs. — On p. 838 f. of Vol. I Rymer prints three short letters from Henry III, all dealing with the same subject, and all written at Kenilworth on the 10th of November 1266; in the first the

<sup>1</sup> *Anglo-Norman Lapidaries*, p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Registrum Epistolarum Fratris Johannis Peckham*, Pref. LVII.

king is styled *Seigneur de Irelande*, in the second and the third *Seigneur de Irelande*. The word 'upland' is found in its genuine London form *upelond* in the *French Chronicle of London*, p. 46; the Anglo-Norman transcription of it, *uplaund*, figures in a Latin document in *Liber Custumarum*, p. 306. — It is remarkable that the earliest instance of the Strand, given by the *O.E.D.*, occurs in the Anglo-Norman form *le Straunde* in a Latin document dated 1246. The London pronunciation was [strɔ:nd] at that time.

These *aun* spellings, which transliterate Middle English [ɔ:n], raise the question, what was the exact nature of the first element of the diphthong *au* in this combination? It seems to me that we are justified in assuming that in the course of the thirteenth century it became more or less rounded. Even at the beginning of the thirteenth century it may have been an *a* of the "dark" variety, like the *a* in Scotch *man*.

The prior of Christ Church, Canterbury, had an agent in France. His name is generally spelt *Launge*, *Lit. Cant.* LXX, LXXI, etc., but occasionally *Lange*, *l.c.* CLXI, CLXII, etc. In letter DXXXIV, dated 1334, however, he is called Jon *Longe*. In another letter in the same collection, viz. in No. CMLXIX, dated 1396, we find *blonche*, and *tondis* (three times). In a document printed in Rymer's *Fœdera*, V, 849, dated 1356, there are five instances of *bondes*, 'companies of soldiers'; in another document, VII, 114, dated 1376, *diamond* occurs twice, and *diamondes* once. Earlier examples of such *o* spellings are found in Tanqueray's *Lettres anglo-françaises*, viz. *rondues*, p. 1, date 1265, and *grons*, 'grands', p. 39, date 1283. Busch<sup>1</sup> even quotes an instance of *estrounge* from *Year Books* III, 437.

"Although the spelling of scribes is a poor guide," as Studer remarks<sup>2</sup>, there is reason to suppose, especially in connection with a similar phonetic change in the case of Anglo-Norman words in Middle English, which will be discussed later on, that before Anglo-Norman became a dead language, *aun* had become [ɔun], and subsequently [ɔ:n], though probably not everywhere, but only in some areas (London? South?).

It may be mentioned in passing that from the beginning of the fifteenth century, when Anglo-Norman was only a written language, every *au* may have been regarded as a symbol for [ɔ:]; this would explain the curious spelling *waude*, *Liber Albus*, p. 422, which transcribes M.E. *wōd* < *wād*. Perhaps *husebaundes* and *husebonde*, both on p. 112 in the same Anglo-Norman document might also be quoted, though in this case the *au* spelling may be due to the analogy of *laund-lond*. In any case the scribe must have looked upon *au* and *o* as alternative spellings. *Liber Albus* was compiled in 1419.

In the second paragraph of this paper it has been remarked that all the words under discussion appear in Middle English and in Early Modern English in two forms. This, however, does not apply to the loanwords found in Early Middle English texts down to about 1225 or 1230. The following list of these early loanwords goes to show that as long as the Anglo-Normans still pronounced [ān] the English, when taking over *an-* words, anglicized them by substituting oral *a* for nasal *a*.

Charter Eadward in Cod. Dipl. IV (a. 1066), *cancheler* (*O.E.D.*)  
*Peterb. Chron.*, 1093, 1123, and 1137, *cancel(e)r*.

<sup>1</sup> *Laut- und Formenlehre der Anglonormannischen Sprache des XIV Jahrhunderts*, p. 13.

<sup>2</sup> *l.c.* p. 5.

*Prudentius Glosses, flank (O.E.D.).*

*Lamb. Hom., 53, blanchet.*

*Trin. Hom., 177, sergantes.*

*Orm., 8102, bezzsannz.*

*Vices and Virt., 17.20 and 17.21, besantes; 33.5, lampe.*

*St. Marh., p. 3, changede; p. 5, semblant; p. 5 and p. 12, warant; p. 11, crauant; p. 20, lampe; p. 22, grandame.*

*Lazamon, 14757 A (and B), mantel; 23799 A, olifantes, gen. sing.; (B holifantes).*

*Ureison of oure Louerde, O.E.H. I, 189, abandun.*

*Sawles Warde, O.E.H. I, 247, semblant.*

Probably *angel*, *angle* in *Trin. H. 31, Vices and Virt., 43.19; 53.26, etc. (passim)*, and *archangles, Paternoster 121, and Sawles Warde 259, are also from Anglo-Norman.*

When through the influence of English both Anglo-Normans and Englishmen had got into the way of pronouncing [aun] instead of [ān], the influx of *aun*-forms into English began. An Englishman who knew Anglo-Norman would, when using an *aun*-word in speaking English, of course pronounce it in the way he was accustomed to, and in writing it down, he would spell it with *au*.

The earliest Middle English text in which such *au*-spellings occur is the *Ancren Riwe*, as edited by Morton from MS. Cotton Nero A, XIV, which was probably written in the second quarter of the thirteenth century. If my count is correct, there are 46 *aum*-, *aun*-spellings in this text. The following words only occur with *au* (some of them several times): *asaumple*, *auaunceð*, *baundune*, *bisaumpleð* (-ed), *chaunge* (noun), *chaungen*, *chaungunge*, *creaunt*, *cwitaunce*, *daunger*, *desperaunce*, *haunche*, *obseruaunces*, *pitaunce*, *raunsun*, *semblaunt* (10 times!), *uaumpez*. Only *an* is found in *dangerus*, *fantisme*, *ignorance*, *igranted*, *manciple*, *seruant*, *truwandise*. On p. 346 we find *circumstances* and *circumstaunces* (*circumstances* also on p. 332), and Modern English 'scandal' occurs in the *Ancren Riwe* in three forms: *scandle* (p. 12), *schandle* (p. 380), and *schaundle* (p. 108 and p. 116).

What strikes us at once is that the *au*-spelling is not consistently carried through in the *Ancren Riwe*. The same remark may be made with regard to many Middle English texts. Sometimes *an* and *aun* were merely alternative spellings, as appears from rhymes like *chaunce* : *penance*, *Curs. M. 17567*; *meschance* : *penaunce*, *Chaucer, Cant. T., Ellesmere MS., H. 11*; *obseruances* : *meschaunces*, *Id., Ibid., F 1291*, and many others that might be adduced. Still there can be no reasonable doubt as to the original meaning of the two spellings: *branch* and *braunch*, *chamber* and *chaumber*, *change* and *chaunge*, etc. represented two different pronunciations. The *a* must have been short. It certainly was in *Orm's bezzsannz*. If it had been long, there would have been occasional *aa*-spellings in Middle English. Further, from what we know about the history of English vowels we are bound to conclude that *lamp*, *standard*, *vamp*, *aunt*, *blanch*, *command*, *grant*, etc. can only have descended from forms that had [a] in Middle English. It deserves mention that not only *aunt*, *branch*, *chant*, *dance*, but also *ancient*, *chamber*, *change*, *danger*, *mange*, *stranger*, have [a], [æ], or [e] in several dialects of Scotland and the North of England, and occasionally in other dialects as well. For detailed information I must refer to Wright's *Dial. Gr.*, § 202 and § 206. From the same paragraphs it appears that [ɔ:], which in Standard English is only heard in a few words, has been preserved far more extensively in dialects; [ɔ] also occurs.



It might be objected that *an*-forms could only be borrowed from early Anglo-Norman, and could, therefore, not be numerous. It is true that only a comparatively small number of such forms are recorded in Early Middle English, but it does not necessarily follow that they were the only ones that had found their way into English by about 1225. Even if Early M.E. only borrowed the fifteen or sixteen Anglo-Norman *an*- words actually found in early texts, there would after some time be fifteen pairs like *change*—*chaunge*. People who were more or less bilingual, and pronounced [tʃaundʒə] when speaking Anglo-Norman, would use the same pronunciation when they spoke English, and thus the new pronunciation would gradually also be adopted by speakers who did not know Anglo-Norman. If the later borrowings were all *aun*-forms, it is quite likely that on the analogy of the existing doublets new pairs were formed. There must, however, have been a fairly long period during which the older Anglo-Norman pronunciation kept its ground by the side of the later one, and during this period doublets could be taken up by English. The study of living languages shows us that 'old-fashioned' pronunciations are often a long time dying out.

We have seen that there is reason to suppose that Anglo-Norman *aun* became [ɔ:n] in some parts of England. As Anglo-Norman had become a dead language before the end of the fourteenth century, this sound change never got beyond its initial stage, or rather, the new pronunciation had not yet spread all over the country, when Anglo-Norman ceased to be spoken.

When occasional spellings appear in Anglo-Norman manuscripts written at the time when Anglo-Norman was still a living language in every sense of the word, and was consequently, like every living language, subject to phonetic changes, one naturally expects to find the same kind of occasional spellings in English texts. It may safely be assumed that from about the beginning of the thirteenth century a constantly increasing number of those who spoke Anglo-Norman pronounced it as if it was English, very much the same way as, *mutatis mutandis*, English schoolboys used to pronounce French: ['pa:lei vuu 'frænsei ?] with falling intonation.<sup>1</sup>

In Middle English certain sound groups, like *aumb*, *aump*, *aunce*, *aund*, *aunge*, *aunt* (to quote them in the usual spelling), only occurred in Anglo-Norman loanwords; they formed a group by themselves, and may very well have gone their own way in the evolution of English sounds; *aum* and *aun* in these groups became [ɔ:m], [ɔ:n].

The occurrence of a single occasional spelling is, generally speaking, not of much importance; such a spelling may merely be a scribal error. Still it does seem significant that the first *on*-spelling in an English text, namely *ongel* in the *Kentish Sermons*, p. 27, is about contemporaneous with the first *on*-spelling in Anglo-Norman.

It has been suggested that "French *an*, having lost its nasal value in England, was assimilated to Old English *a*, and followed the same evolution. As the change of *a* > *o* only began in the twelfth century, there seems to be no reason why it should not have included the French *a*."<sup>2</sup> This theory postulates the introduction at an early date — not later than about 1200! — of a large number of Anglo-Norman *an*-words into those English dialects in

<sup>1</sup> Used to? I do not know whether English schoolboys are on better terms with French pronunciation nowadays.

<sup>2</sup> Prior, *Cambridge Anglo-Norman Texts*. p. XXIII.

which  $\bar{a}$  became [ɔ:] in the twelfth century. Nearly all the Early Middle English texts in which instances of Anglo-Norman *an*-words occur, contain evidence of the change of English  $\bar{a} > \bar{o}$ ; in none of them, however, is there a single instance of *on* < *an* in a French word. The same applies, with one exception (*ongel* in the *Kentish Sermons*) to thirteenth century texts, in which *on*- and *oan*-spellings would not have been rare, if Anglo-Norman *an* had coalesced with English  $\bar{a}$  in the first half of the twelfth century.

The change from [au] to [ɔ:], both in Anglo-Norman and in English, must have taken place in two stages. The Anglo-Norman spelling *estrounge*, cited higher up, may illustrate the intermediate [ou] stage. In English texts I have noted about a dozen *oun*-spellings. As none of these texts date from before the latter part of the fourteenth century, the *oun*-spellings do not justify the inference that the [oun] pronunciation was still current at the time when they were written down, although this is not impossible. Probably they were taken over from older exemplars. The instances I have noted are:

West Midlands. *Anturs of Arther*, XXV, 6, *dounger*; *Stanzaic Life of Chr.*, 4513, *comofndementz*; 6585 *comounde*, inf.; *Tundale*, Cott. MS., 2076, *deamownde*. *Apol. Lollards*, p. 36, *comounded*.

East Midlands. *Warkworth's Chron.*, p. 11, *chounge*; *Curs. M.*, T 6893, *almounde*.

South. Trevisa, *Polychronicon*, VIII. 263, *avounsede*; f. 259.21, *avounsede*<sup>1</sup>; *Bevis of Hamt.*, 1537, *romounse*; *St. Editha*, 4158, *douncede*; *Shillingford's Letters*, p. 137 and p. 139, *commowndement*.

Kent? *Shoreham's Poems*, 94.248, *veniounse*, 'vengeance'.

London, S. E. Midlands. *Octavian*, 793, *chounge*; *Cely Papers*, No. 60, *recomeownde* (sic!); No. 113, *recommound*.

Occasionally *ou* with the value of [ɔ:] is found in English words too, as, *foungeþ*, 1 pers. pl., *Shoreham's P.*, 13.338; *a-founde* (< O.E. *afondian*; rhymes with *under-stonde*), *Ibid.* 23.632; *loundys*, 'lands', *St. Editha*, 570.

The *Ayenbite* is the earliest Middle English text that contains a great number of *on*-spellings. This probably means that the [ɔ:n] pronunciation came into vogue in Canterbury earlier than elsewhere. It will be remembered that *on*-spellings are also found in the 'French' letters written at Christchurch Monastery, Canterbury. Another possibility is that Dan Michel may have been the first scribe who, in this particular case at least, had the courage to write as he spoke, and to deviate from the current spelling. However this may be, he did not use the *o*-spelling consistently. He wrote

*a* in *angle*, *angles*, 20, 21, 127; *archangle*, 1; *balance*, 30, 91; *candele*, 102, 106; *chancelier*, 243; *salamandre*, 167.

*a* in *chambren*, 234; *tyrans*, 182; but *o* in *chombre*, 215; *chomberier*, 171, *tiront*, 230; cf. *present*, 189, but *presont*, 218;

*ance* in *abundance*, 261; *constance*, 167; *discordance*, 259; *distemperance*, 153; *perseuerance*, 208; *substance*, 113; *temperance*, 4, 124; but *-once* in *penonce*, 170, 179 (bis), 221; *repentonce* 201; *purueyonce*, 156; *sostinonce*, 54, 139, 218;

*aun* in *adaunteþ*, 167; *endaunture*, 220; *enchautement*, 43; *fiaunce*, 164; *launde*, 216;

*an* in *granteþ*, 7; *grantinge*, 10, 11, 47; *grantinges*, 47, but *aun* in *graunteþ*, 225; *grauntinge*, 47, 212.

In several words, which will be given lower down, only *o* is found.

In English words Dan Michel sometimes wrote *a*, and sometimes *o* before nasal + consonant. We generally find *a* before final *mb*, *nd*, *ng*, *nk*; *lamb*,

<sup>1</sup> Pfeffer, *Die Sprache des Pol. John Trevisa* (Dissertation), 1912, p. 47.

*hand, lang, onþank*, and *o*, if the *b, d, g, k* in these consonant groups belong to the next syllable: *lombe, honde, longe, hongī, stondinde, þonke, þonki*, but exceptions occur here and there: *þousond*, 219 (bis).

The rule Dan Michel generally observed in the spelling of English, does not apply to French words. It is, in fact, impossible to discover anything like a rule in the way he employed *an, aun* and *on*. That in many (most?) cases the [an] and the [ɔ:n] pronunciation were co-existent may be regarded as certain; the *aun*-spelling may be traditional, but I am inclined to believe that the [aun]-pronunciation was still heard in Canterbury in Dan Michel's time.

The area where the [ɔ:n] pronunciation originated was probably situated in the South-East of England, and comprised Kent, London, and the South-East Midlands. From there the new pronunciation spread all over the country, so that by about the middle of the fifteenth century it was known everywhere.

The examples of *on*-spellings in the following list have been arranged — rather roughly here and there — according to the dialects represented in the manuscripts.

North. *Curs. M.*, G 21611, *mondee*, 'maundy'. Jordan, *Handbuch*, p. 199, quotes *change* from the Northern Chaucer MS. (Gg).

West Midlands. *Pearl*, 1046, *lompeylst* (MS. *lombe-*); 104, *plonttez*; *Cleanness* 487, *bronch*; *Curs. M.*, F 6895, *almondes*; *Pueritia vel Infancia Christi* (in Horstmann, *A. E. Leg.*), 113.107 *bronchys*; 114.176, *change*; 117.439, *chongyt*, pret.; *Stanzaic Life of Chr.*, 5921, *garlond*; 6749, *comondet*, pret.; 10620, *chonge*; *Aunters of Arth.*, X, 6, *chonget*, pret.; XXXV. 9, *stondartis*; *Cov. Leet B.*, 157, *stondard*; *Court of Sap.*, 1982, *strong*<sup>1</sup>; *Book of Curt.*, 801, *strongere*, 'stranger'; *Plumpton Corr.*, p. 4, *comonde*. *Apol. Lollards*, p. 12, *marchondise*; p. 95, *chong*.

East Midlands. *Havelok*, 764, *gronge*<sup>2</sup>; *Amis and Amil.*, Douce MS., 1639, *chomber*; *Bokenam's Leg.*, 192. 270 and 277; 194. 348, *garlondys*; *Prompt. Parv.*, Camden Soc., 187, and *Ibid.*, Mayhew 187, *garlond(e)*; *Ibid.*, Camden Soc., 208, and *Ibid.*, Mayhew 198, 202, and 214, *gronge*; *Ibid.*, Camden Soc., 342, and *Ibid.*, Mayhew, 292, *monge presawnte*; *Sowd. of Bab.*, 2717, *stondart*; *Paston L.*, No. 296. *grevonse*; No. 396, *chonge*; *Curs. M. T.*, 5974, 10232, 10581, 11492, 17720, *offrond* (rhyming with *londe, stonde*, etc.); *Ibid.*, Laud MS. 10232, 17720, *offrond*; *Ibid. T.*, 5884, *seruonde*; 2351, *couenond* (: *fond*, pret.); 7484, *couenonde* (: *stonde*); 7588, *presond* (: *brond*). *Fifteenth Cent. Courtesy Bk.*, 11.21; 11.23; 12.7; 12.37; 13.18; 16.10; 16.29, *commond(e)*, inf.; 11.17; 14.24; 15.2; 16.4, *commondmentes*; 16.8, *commondyth*; *Pol., Rel. and Love Poems*, 307 (d) *chongyd*<sup>3</sup>.

London, S.E. Midlands. *Kyng Alis.*, 3606, *lonse*; 6531, *hont*, subst. (: *olifaunt*); *Lyb. Disc.* (Kaluzs), 289 C, *Celebronche*; N, *Celabronche*; 367 N, *Celabronche*; 268 N, *honche* (Kölbinger, *Eng. Stud.*, I. 128); *Octavian*, 95, *chongen*; 790, *to chonge*; *Siege of Rouen*, 102, E, *donger*; 833 E, *stronge*; 1015 C4, *stronge*; *Gregory's Chron.*<sup>4</sup>, 117 and 127 *strongers*; 227, *chonge*; 233 and 238, *donger*; 212, *longage*; 214, *longeage*; *Cely P.*, No. 42, *waront* (twice); No. 43, *waronte*; No. 54 and No. 57, *chonge*; *Caxton, Myrroure*, p. 89, *admont*, 'adamant', and *dyamont*.<sup>5</sup>

Kent. *Shoreham's Poems*, 110, 333, *chonse* (the MS. has *thonse*); *Ayenbite*, 82, *auonci*; 68, *auonceþ*; 200 and 210 *auontage*; 60, 61 (bis), and 171 *blondere(s)*; 10, 57, and 75, *blondingges*; 141, *blondingges*; 9, *bronches*; 104, *chonge*, subst.; 104, *chongi*; 104, 105, and 120, *chonginde*; 129, *chongeþ*; 187, 232 (bis), and 233 *lompe*, 'lamp'; 189, 218 (bis), 233,

<sup>1</sup> According to *Einleitung* p. 5, of Spindler's edition the reading of M is *donger*. This is also the reading in Gairdner's edition Camden Soc. New Series XVII, p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> This early example is not above suspicion, as it rhymes with *fonge* inf.

<sup>3</sup> This poem was written in 1448-9 by John Metham of Norwich, scholar of Cambridge.

<sup>4</sup> Gregory was a native of Suffolk, but lived in London.

<sup>5</sup> *Diamond* seems to be the only word in which the *on*-spelling has been preserved.



*lompen*; 39, *marchons*; 84, *olyfont*; 35, *ronsoune*; 6, *sc londre*; 27, 137, and 211, *semblont*; 32, *seriont*; 33 and 188, *sergont(e)*; 35 and 39, *sergons*; 37, *seruons*.

South. Trevisa, transl. Higden's *Pol.*, II, 157, *longage* (O.E.D.); Paston L., No. 68, *lonchyd*, *stondert*; Shillingford's *Letters*, *chonge*, *lonch* (frequently; Ekwall, *Eng. Stud.* XLIX, 282); *longage* (Jordan, *Handb.*, p. 199); *St. Editha*, 4549, *stonchede*.

Ireland. Kildare Poems<sup>1</sup>, *Fall and Passion*, 52 *chonge*, inf.; *Why can't I be a Nun?*, 46, *chonge*, inf.; 358 *garland*; *Ten Commandments*, 33, *comondement*; p. 228 (Heuser), *marchondis*.

The following examples I prefer to leave unclassified.

Rob. of Gl., *Chron.*, C and β,<sup>2</sup> 7117, *stronge*; 7118 C, and 11044 C, *stronge*; *Two Cookery Bks.*, 98, *plonte*; Christina (in Horstmann, A. E. *Leg.*), 500 *stronge*.

Wright, *Pol. Poems*, II, 251, *galonttes* (accent on *ont*).

*Pol.*, *Rel.*, and *Love Poems*, 156. 381, *monde*, 'maundy.'

The *on*-spellings in West Midland texts may be interpreted in two ways. They may stand for [ɔ:n], but as in the West Midlands *o* followed by a nasal did not become *a*, they may also point to an analogical sound change, i.e. *am* and *an* in words of Anglo-Norman origin may have become [ɔm], [ɔn]. This would account for the [ɔ] in *aunt*, *branch*, *chance*, *chant*, *dance* in some modern West Midland dialects.<sup>3</sup>

When after the introduction of the art of printing English orthography gradually became more or less regular, the old-established traditional spellings were generally adhered to. The attempts at representing sounds, especially vowels, phonetically, sometimes made by fifteenth and early sixteenth century writers (occasional spellings) had no lasting effect upon English orthography. These spellings disappeared again. The *on*-spelling in Anglo-Norman *aun*-words is one of them: it is rarely found after 1500. Machyn has *onnt*, 'aunt' (p. 61), *commondyd* and *commondment* (p. 169), and *monde*, 'maundy' (p. 230); compare *o* = [ɔ:] < [au] in *holpeny* (p. 18), *hopene* (p. 243), *nothe* and *nosty*, 'naughty' (p. 261).

So far the question why the value of *o* in the *on*-spellings cited higher up must be taken to be [ɔ:] has not been touched upon. My reasons for assuming that this vowel was long are:

a. Nearly all the texts in which there are *oun*-spellings, also contain *on*-spellings. As both spellings also occur in texts written in the West Midlands, the obvious conclusion is that the change of [aun] > [ɔ:n] also took place there, although this does not exclude the possibility of [an] having become [ɔn].

b. In the *Ayenbite*, *om*, *on* in English words like *lombe*, *honden*, *londes*, *stondinde*, *uondi*, etc. undoubtedly mean [ɔ:m], [ɔ:n], while *ām*, *ān* have remained unchanged: *handlinge*, *hand*, *onderstand*, *onderstanst*, *onderstant*, *lamb*, *lambren*, *pans*, 'pence', *ansuere*. From this it follows that *om*, *on* in French words must denote [ɔ:m], [ɔ:n]; if a word is spelt in two ways, Dan Michel must have pronounced [an] and [ɔ:n]: *chambren*—*chombre*, *tyrans*—*tiront*, *semblant* (p. 27) — *semblont* (p. 137), and words with the suffix *-ance*, *-once*.

c. Except, of course, in the West Midland dialect, M.E. *ām*, *ān* in Germanic words remained unrounded, as, *bramble*, *lamb*, *hand*, *land*, *stand*, *candle*, *handle(n)*, *gandre*, *wandre(n)*, *answere*, *answeren*, *scant*, *slant*, *want*,

<sup>1</sup> In Furnivall, *Early English Poems*, and in Heuser, *Kildare Gedichte*.

<sup>2</sup> MS. C written 1390-1400; MS. β early 15th century.

<sup>3</sup> Wright, *Dial. Gr.*, § 202.

wante(n), and place-names like *Sandwich*, *Wandsworth* (with *a* from the City dialect), etc..

d. There are no *on*-spellings in the case of French words that had no *aun*-forms in Middle English, as, *fantasy*, *fansy*, *Andrew*, *Antony*. If the *au*-forms soon disappeared, and only *a*-forms were left, no rounding took place either: *janglen*, *blank*, *flank*, *cancre*; cf. English words of Germanic origin like *hang*, *bank*, *thank*.

That [aun] became [ɔ:n] in late Middle English, and that [an] remained unchanged, is strikingly illustrated by the evolution of the M.E. descendants of OE. *andswaru*, *andswarian*. ME. *answere(n)* has a short vowel in the first syllable (> [a:] in Modern English). In the beginning of the fifteenth century a new spelling, *aunswere*, *awnswe* cropped up; it enjoyed a great vogue for a considerable period, and was (traditionally!) used until about 1600. This *aun* must reflect a real sound change, which, like the spelling, may have been due to the influence of *chaunce*, *daunce*. It shared the development of *aun* in French words, hence Shillingford's to *oonswer* (p. 40). The numerous *onsware*-spellings in West Midland texts may have to be accounted for differently.

In late Middle English [au] was sometimes smoothed into [a:]; thus we find *saafly* in *An Engl. Chron.* (Camden Soc.) p. 14 (date 1471). This sound change may have affected *aungel*, *chaunge*, *daunger*, etc., and *auncient*, *chaumber*. Unfortunately very little direct evidence of this smoothing has been forthcoming so far. There is an *aan*-spelling in the first extract from Trevisa's translation of Higden's *Polychronicon*, printed by Morris and Skeat in *Specimens* II, viz. *straange*, 237.61. One might with equal justice build up a theory on the occurrence of occasional *aan*-spellings in Anglo-Norman, as, *taant*, *Anglo-Norman Lapidaries*, 53.65, v.r. (date of MS. 1250, or a little later); *graant* (noun) in a letter written 1272-1300, Tanqueray, *Lettres anglo-franç.*, p. 72; *aan*, 'year,' in another letter, dated 1314, *l.c.* p. 104.

In some late M.E. texts, and also in early Modern English, spellings like *chainge*, (*chaynge*), *dainger*, (*daynger*), etc. are not infrequent. These spellings are not perspicuous. Luick<sup>1</sup> and Jordan<sup>2</sup> hold that the *i*-glide developed after *au* had become *ā* (they both treat the smoothing as an indisputable fact). It is not clear to me why long *a* must be postulated. The same *i*-glide is sometimes found in Anglo-Norman texts from the middle of the thirteenth century onwards, as *Horn C*, 5145, *maingier*, 'manger'; *Ibid.* O, 5168, *mainge*, 'a meal'; *Lettres anglo-franç.*, p. 36, *Dimeynche*; *Ibid.* p. 99, *Dimaigne*; *French Chron. of London*, p. 13, *dimaygne*; *Ibid.*, p. 57, *dimainge*; *Liber Cust.*, 228, *Dimaigne*. There is no reason to suppose that the *a* in *manger*, *dimanche* was long, nor can it have been long in the earliest Middle English example I have found, *angles*, pl., *Vices and Virtues*, 15.11, and 113.16.

More than one point in connection with the origin of late Middle English *-ānge* and *ainge* is still obscure.

To sum up, Anglo-Norman *ām*, *ān* was represented in late Middle English by

[am], [an], which have become [æm], [æn] in *lamp*, *vamp*, *bank*, *blank*, *bland*, *grand*, *salamander*, *standard*, while [an] has become [a:n] in *command*, *branch*, *dance*, *lance*, *aunt*, *grant*, *plant*, etc.

<sup>1</sup> *Historische Gramm.* § 436.

<sup>2</sup> *Handbuch*, p. 199, *Anm.*

- [ɔ:m], [ɔ:n], surviving in *daunt, haunt, haunch, launch*, etc.  
 [a:m], [a:n], which have become [e:m], [e:n] in *chamber, ancient, change, danger, strange*.  
 [ain], only in *aincient, chainge*, etc.; this *ai* may have had something to do with the origin of the present-day pronunciation of *ancient, change*, etc.  
 [aum], [aun], which may have lingered on for some time. When they died out, is unknown. The information, such as it is, that can be gathered from the earliest grammarians, is worthless in so far as the 'value' of *au* is concerned. Later authorities (Hodges, Cooper) do not mention a diphthongic pronunciation.

For a long time the pronunciation of many of the words that form the subject of the present enquiry must have been unsettled, hence the frequently conflicting statements made by different old 'authorities'. Even at the present day several of them are still pronounced in more than one way, in spite of the levelling and normalizing effect that constantly increasing intercourse, education, and other factors, have upon English pronunciation.

A detailed account of the distribution of the various types of pronunciation during the last three or four centuries, and of the shifts that have taken place, cannot be written as yet, and it is doubtful whether it ever will be possible to write it. The material available is unsatisfactory; it is very incomplete, and sometimes its trustworthiness is open to suspicion.

Hart is the first 'grammarian' who mentions the pronunciation to which modern [tʃeɪndʒ] goes back. In § 19 (p. 91 f.) of *John Hart's Pronunciation* Jespersen gives a list of words that according to Hart have 'a' (long); in this list *change* is found alongside of *able, ages, blame, brazen*, and many others. Hart was evidently acquainted with other ways of pronouncing this word, for *change* also figures among the words that had 'a (short)' (§ 20), and in the list of *au*-words, — although it is impossible to ascertain what sound Hart meant by his *au*-notation.<sup>1</sup>

The precursor of present-day [a:] in *dance*, i.e. [æ:], or some such sound, seems to have been known to Gill. On p. 32, 30 ff. he calls attention to a few of the sins committed in the eastern counties. "*Orientales ... attenuant: dicunt enim fir, pro fjer ignis: kiver, pro kuver tegmen: ea, pro a. vt to deans, pro dans saltare.*" As Gill does not employ *ea* as a phonetic symbol, *deans* must be a semi-phonetic spelling on a traditional basis, and *ea* must have the value Gill attributed to it in the word *meate*, viz [ɛ:] (p. 33). The *Orientales* made the same 'mistakes' as *Nostræ Mopsæ*, on whom Gill is down on p. 33: they made their vowels thin and slender. What Gill means by *attenuant* is quite clear from the examples given on p. 32 and p. 33: back vowels are replaced by front ones, and close vowels are substituted for open ones. What Gill considered to be the correct pronunciation of *dance* cannot be determined; he spells it phonetically in two ways: *dans*, probably with [æ], and *dâns*, with the same vowel symbol as he uses in *âl* 'all', *drâ*, 'draw,' etc.; what *â* stands for is unknown.

Hodges, 1644<sup>2</sup>, has *a*, i.e. [æ] in *dance, lamp, lance, plants, planted*; *â*, i.e. [ɔ:] in *aunt, branch(es), chamber, chance, command*, etc., 14 words in all, and *ë*, i.e. [e:] in *ancient, change, danger, manger, range(r), strange*,

<sup>1</sup> Jespersen, l.c., p. 44.

<sup>2</sup> Richard Hodges, *The English Primrose*. I have used the wordlist in Kauter's reprint, Heidelberg 1930.



*stranger(s)*. In two words, *dance* and *lance*, Hodges gives [æ] and [ɔ:].

Cooper is the first grammarian who clearly distinguishes four different vowels in the words we are concerned with, namely [æ], [æ:], [e:], and [ɔ:]. Among the words that have 'a brevis,' i.e. [æ], p. 35, the only one that interests us now is *grand*. In another list on the same page Cooper gives words that have 'a longa', i.e. [æ:]; this list contains *grant* and *lanch*. In a third list, also on p. 35, we find *grange* among words that have 'a exilis,' i.e. [e:], to which must be added *stranger*, *strange*, *manger*, *mangy*, given on p. 34. The [ɔ:] sound, 'a gutturalis', which Cooper heard in *off*, *horn*, *frost*, and in *augh-* and *ough-*words, is dealt with on p. 44 f.; [ɔ:] occurs in *daunt*, *jaundice*, *jaunt*, *vaunt*, *tawny*, and in a few other words, "scribuntur cum au vel aw; cum au vel a, ut *paunch* ... *enhanse*, *hant*, *mander*, *dant*, *jant*."

The information Müller has gathered from Elphinston's works<sup>1</sup> is of a somewhat startling nature. It seems that Elphinston only recognized three types of pronunciation. Of 'a slender shut opened,' i.e. [æ], there are about twenty-five instances in his works, as, *aunt*, *avaunt*, *chant*, *daunt*, etc.; *command*, *grand*, *Maundy-Thursday*, etc.; *chance*, *dance*, *branch*, *haunch*, etc.. The quantity of this vowel is uncertain. Elphinston gives 'a slender open', i.e. [e:] in seven words, *chamber*, *angel*, *change*, *danger*, *manger*, *range*, *ancient*, and 'a broad,' i.e. [ɔ:] in only two, *lawn* and *tawny*.

The most salient point in the history of the Middle English *am* (*aum*)-, *an* (*aun*)- words is the gradual disappearance of the [ɔ:] pronunciation. About the middle of the seventeenth century the majority of these words probably still had [ɔ:]. Most of these seventeenth century [ɔ:] words are pronounced, or may be pronounced, with [a:] at present. This cannot be the consequence of a phonetic change; [æ:], which later on became [a:], must have been substituted for [ɔ:]. This [æ:] type may have developed in Standard English by the side of [ɔ:]. Smith seems to have pronounced short *a* in *chance* (23a). If the information obtained from Hart's and Gill's works is worth anything, we must assume that they pronounced some kind of a [æ?] in a few of these words. According to Jespersen's list *l.c.* § 20, Hart pronounced short *a* in *advanced*, *chandle*, *example*, and Gill gives *a* in *branch*, *chanceth*, *chancellor*, *dance* (also *dâns*), *examples*, *planted*. The short vowel, probably [æ], may have become [æ:] in the seventeenth century through combinative lengthening before [nd], [nt], [ntʃ], [ns]. This is not impossible, but seems unlikely in view of the fact that [æ] before [f], [s] and [p] was lengthened much earlier. It is more likely that the [æ:] type of pronunciation began to penetrate into Standard English in the seventeenth century from some speech area where [æ] had been lengthened before [nd], etc. some time before 1600. Now Gill can generally be trusted when he expresses his disapproval of what he considers incorrect, or when he calls attention to dialectical deviations. Can we believe him when he says that *deans* is an East Midland pronunciation? If so, we ought to be grateful to Gill, for this bit of information gives us a hint as to where the [æ:] type may have originated.

Amsterdam.

W. VAN DER GAAF.

<sup>1</sup> *Englische Lautlehre nach James Elphinston, Anglistische Forschungen*, 43; Heidelberg 1914, p. 138 ff.

## Notes and News.

**Professor A. G. van Kranendonk.** The appointment of Mr. Van Kranendonk to the Chair of English Literature at the University of Amsterdam will have been greeted with satisfaction by many readers of *English Studies*. It is probably needless to recall that from the foundation of our journal in 1919, he has been one of its principal literary contributors. The full list of his contributions would be too long to quote here; we will only refer to his articles on modern authors, such as Joseph Conrad and Katherine Mansfield, his essays on Charles Lamb, and on Spenserian echoes in Shakespeare, and to his numerous reviews. Apart from these, he has found time to contribute to various other periodicals, and to write an excellent survey of English literature since 1880. We hope that his new duties will tend to increase rather than diminish the number of his publications, and that a good many of them will continue to find their way to our journal.

---

**Misprints in the Tauchnitz Edition.** In a brief notice in the August number, we complained of the serious misprints disfiguring several volumes of the Tauchnitz collection of British and American authors, and advised students in quest of linguistic material to refer to the original editions. We were not a little surprised to receive a letter from the publishers shortly afterwards, accompanied by leaves from the original, American, edition of the volume discussed (nr. 5092), and pointing out that the errors to which we had taken exception actually occurred in the original text. In order to show our readers that we had not been seeing ghosts instead of misprints, we quote the sentences in question with the necessary context, with the incriminated words italicized:

... "this revolting and most un-English murder." I am not quite certain what constitutes a simon-pure, all-English murder; but I live in hope of finding out.

An Englishman might justifiably *report* that whatever the distinguishing features of an all-British murder might be, one of them certainly would be its comparative infrequency of occurrence. (Read: *retort*.)

... in so far as it embraces servants, waiters, *but* conductors, and people in similar semi-public occupations ... (Read: *bus*.)

Food is comparatively cheap in England; rents are kept low by a continuance of the war-time restrictions; yet, for all that, the real wages of the British workman are unduly high in comparison with Continental standards, it cannot be said with any show of justification that his standard of life is high. (Cancel comma after 'for all that'.)

It also has meant that at least a proportion of the men who would have been bending over looms or groping through mine galleries have used their enforced leisure to renew their acquaintance, with fresh air and outdoor exercise. (Cancel comma after 'acquaintance'.)

They have to handle sudden floods and gusts of vehicles which get *damned* and then released in the narrow, tortuous streets. (Read: *dammed*.)

In the meantime this government ... had definitely carried over into peace-time budgets the relative *incidents* of taxation established during the war-time emergence. (Read: *incidence*.)

While suspending judgment on the provenance of similar misprints in other volumes of the series, we of course entirely withdraw their imputation to the Tauchnitz compositors in the case of nr. 5092. We purposely write 'compositors', however, not 'proof-readers', as we cannot accept the excuse made for the latter: 'Our printers and proof-readers could not but suppose that these spellings are used in America, so these erroneous spellings were not altered.' American spelling does deviate from English in a number of cases — mostly for the better — but Americans do *not* write *report* for *retort*, or *dammned* for *dammed*, nor do they insert commas to destroy the meaning of a sentence — as the supervisors of the Tauchnitz press might know by now. In cases like the above, it was their obvious duty to amend the corrupt original.

The Tauchnitz Edition is widely used on the Continent, not by the general reader only, but also by students of modern English, as innumerable quotations in books and articles testify. If it wishes to keep the support of this latter class, it will have to see that its imprint remains (or becomes) a guarantee of textual reliability.

## Reviews.

*The Year's Work in English Studies*. Volumes VII—XII, 1926—1931. [Vol. XII, 1931, publ. May 1933, edited by F. S. BOAS and M. S. SERJEANTSON; 342 pp.] London, Milford, 1928—1933. Price of vol. VII, 7/6; later vols. 10/6; members of the English Association, 3/6.

*Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature*. Volumes VII—XII, 1926—1931. [Vol. XII, 1931, publ. Dec. 1932, edited by M. S. SERJEANTSON; ix + 272 pp.] Cambridge, Bowes & Bowes, 1927—1932. Price of vol. VII, 6/—; vols. VIII—X, 6/6; later vols. 7/6; members of the Modern Humanities Research Association may obtain copies at reduced prices.

The last time we discussed these indispensable reference works was in 1927. Since then they have continued to be issued at regular intervals, the *Annual Bibliography* preceding *The Year's Work* by a couple of months, neither of them appearing soon enough to satisfy those anxious to keep abreast of current scholarship. In future, it is hoped to bring out the *Annual Bibliography* a few months earlier; perhaps, now that Miss Serjeantson has joined Dr. Boas as co-editor of *The Year's Work*, it will be found feasible to speed up the latter as well. If the American Bibliography of the Modern Language Association of America can be published in the February number of the *PMLA*, and that of the literature of the English Renaissance of the preceding year in the April number of *Studies in Philology*, surely it is not unreasonable, with due allowance made for the larger field they have to cover, to demand a less leisurely process in the editing and printing of the *English* bibliographies.

To say this is not to underrate the devoted labour of the many voluntary workers without whose aid these annual volumes could never be compiled. The staff of contributors to *The Year's Work* is entirely 'British'; that of



the *Annual Bibliography* consists of representatives of most countries where the results of English studies find their way into print, the principal omission being Japan. Another, perhaps the most important, difference is that, whereas the *A. B.* aims at completeness, the object of the *Y. W.* is to select what is of real importance; the *A. B.* merely registers, the *Y. W.* also appraises. Any criticism of their contents must keep these different ends in view.

It would take too much time and space to review the last six volumes of either work in detail, nor would it serve any useful purpose. We will, therefore, confine ourselves to a discussion of the current issues, with a few remarks on former years thrown in for generous measure. Though these observations will be mainly critical, it should not be inferred that we are in any way sceptical as to the merits of the two series; only after twelve years of favourable comment in well-nigh every organ of English studies these merits may be taken for granted. The editors themselves must be getting tired of the usual six-line notices ringing the changes on a few eulogistic epithets, and mentioning the number of items registered; neither have we the slightest doubt but that our criticisms will be accepted in the friendly spirit in which they are offered.

*The Year's Work in English Studies* opens with two chapters entitled: 'Literary History and Criticism: General Works' and: 'Philology: General Works.' In the 1931 volume the former is by Professor Ifor Evans, the latter by Dr. Serjeantson. Both contain accounts, descriptive and critical, of a somewhat disparate assortment of books on literature and language to which the denomination 'General' is sometimes improperly applied. One fails to see, for instance, why a work on present-day English should be labelled thus, with an implicit reproach to the writer for 'making no appeal to history,' whereas one on present-day literature would as a matter of course be dealt with in the chapter 'Nineteenth Century and After,' without any complaint that it did not go right back to Shakespeare or Chaucer. Another drawback is that, so far as works on really 'general' problems are reviewed, the authors, with few exceptions, confine themselves to such as are written in English. This applies especially to the chapter on literature, in which not a single foreign work is discussed. When Prof. Ivor Evans complains that 'It is a noticeable feature of contemporary studies in literature that but little attention is given, in published work at least, to the principles of literary criticism' one wonders if he is speaking for England and America only, and if so, why this restriction is not explicitly stated. To a less extent our objection also applies to the chapter on 'Philology' (it is probably useless to quarrel with English scholars for narrowing down the meaning of this word in a way recognized neither on the Continent nor in America.) The Transactions of the First Linguistic Congress of 1928, to give an example, were never so much as mentioned in the *Y. W.* for that or subsequent years, though the student of modern or older English can hardly afford to ignore the trends of modern linguistics which these Congresses faithfully mirror. Other omissions will be pointed out anon. If considerations of space should be pleaded, our answer is that good space is being wasted on English work of no scholarly value, such as an anthology of poetry 'intended mainly for the purposes of instruction,' or a *Mirror of English* 'designed for the ordinary person who wishes to write good English but does not know how to set about it.' At the same time publications of a somewhat higher, but by no

means the highest, standard are often given a disproportionate amount of space, nearly a page being devoted to a single lecture, no less than three pages to the demolition of the methods and conclusions of two American works on metrics. Clearly, these chapters contain both too much and too little.

In the case of 'Philology' this is not entirely the fault of the internal economy of the chapter itself, but even more of the plan of the whole work. Until the appointment of Miss Serjeantson, who, as stated in the Preface, 'will be primarily responsible for the oversight of the linguistic sections of this annual survey,' the *Y. W.* has from the first been edited by scholars whose interests were purely literary, and who naturally looked upon 'Philology' as a kind of side-show. Another hindrance to the adequate treatment of English language studies has been the nineteenth-century prejudice, now largely discredited on the Continent, but still widely prevalent in England, that scientific linguistics means historical linguistics, and that the study of present-day English is of primarily educational importance. This notion is probably responsible also for the virtual neglect of American English; the contents of *American Speech*, dismissed in half a dozen lines in 1927, have since been completely ignored.

A third factor is indicated in the statement of 'an eminent French philologist,' quoted by *The Times Literary Supplement*, March 30, apropos of Gardiner's *Theory of Speech and Language*, to the effect that 'the English-speaking race [is] not in general interested in linguistic problems.' The truth of this statement is borne out by the small number of English scholars who have up till now taken an active part in the proceedings of the Linguistic Congresses<sup>1</sup>; and this comparative lack of interest in such problems as are threshed out there and in the writings of leading Continental linguists has also left its mark on the treatment of 'Philology' in the successive volumes of *The Year's Work*.<sup>2</sup> One will search these volumes in vain for any reference to such a fascinating subject as the new conception of phonology, though it has practically dominated Continental linguistics for the last five years. Similarly, no one who wishes to know what has been written on the concepts 'aspect' and 'character' in modern and older English, will receive the slightest enlightenment<sup>3</sup>; and these examples might easily be multiplied.

It is not too much to say that, from the point of view of the student of language, the *Y. W.* has from the first been unsatisfactory. If 'Philology' is to remain an integral part of the survey at all — and we should be sorry to see it divorced from 'Literature' — its treatment will have to be reorganized. Perhaps the best plan would be to split up the one chapter now devoted to the subject into two, and to entrust each to a separate contributor. One of these might deal with books and articles on theoretical aspects, both of language in general and of English in particular; the other with studies of the historical development of English; with those concerning the Old English, Middle English and Modern English periods respectively; and with American

<sup>1</sup> And in other team-work of a similar kind. The recently published volume *Psychologie du Langage* (Paris, Alcan, 1933) contains twenty-four chapters, by contributors of eleven different nationalities, one of whom is an Englishman (five are French, six German, two Swiss, two Dutch, etc.)

<sup>2</sup> A number of theoretical studies by foreign scholars were discussed by Miss Hilda Murray in the *Y. W.* for 1926 and 1927.

<sup>3</sup> Except for one sentence in a summary of an article in the *Germ.-Rom. Mon.*: 'Luick concludes with some pertinent criticisms of Deutschbein's classification of *Aktionsarten*.' (*Y. W.* 1930, p. 35.)

English. The contents of these chapters should be checked with the corresponding sections of the *Annual Bibliography* to make sure that nothing of importance has been overlooked.<sup>1</sup> At the same time, studies of a purely linguistic nature now included in the sections on Old or Middle English literature (Callaway's *The Temporal Subjunctive in Old English* and Van der Gaaf's article on *Beon and Habban connected with an inflected infinitive* are cases in point) should be dealt with in the chapter on 'Philology,' where they belong. Otherwise, why not transfer books and articles on modern English to 'Nineteenth Century and After'?

Failing a more thorough treatment of the subject in future issues of *The Year's Work*, students of English on the Continent and in America will seriously have to consider the composition of a separate linguistic survey, biennial if necessary, which shall cater adequately for their needs. We trust, however, that such a measure will become superfluous, once Miss Serjeantson has had time to come to grips with the duties of first linguistic editor of what has up till now been treated as the almost exclusive property of the study of English literature.

About the other chapters we can be brief. That on 'Old English Studies' has this year been entrusted to Mrs. Martin Clarke, who in the 1928 volume, when she was in charge of 'Philology,' cited Kruisinga's *English Grammar for Dutch Students*<sup>3</sup>, Vechtmann-Veth's *Syntax of Living English*, and a number of articles in *English Studies*, as proofs of 'up-to-date linguistic activity at Utrecht;' *English Studies* was said to be 'produced there in English by a group of philologists.' This is not, of course, quite accurate; though the handsome compliment paid to E. S. in the same paragraph disarms all criticism on our part. Mrs. Clarke writes a vigorous, if somewhat hasty style, the vehicle of a shrewd judgment. A remark like 'Indeed it is the form alone of the subjunctive which is used by Morgan Callaway as the basis of statistics' seems to show that what is more or less taken for granted in other countries is still capable of exciting surprise in England; a reflection also suggested by Miss Serjeantson's observation that 'Curme uses the word *genitive* to denote what Kruisinga distinguishes as *genitive* (with formal change) and *prepositional adjunct*.' There are few serious omissions; that of Girvan's *Scoto-Dutch Angelsaksisch Handboek* is at any rate less painful to Dutch readers than the statement in the April number of the *JEGPh* that the appearance of this work 'is something of an event in the history of Dutch Anglistic studies,' showing as it does that Dutch scholars do not confine their activities to modern English! Heusinkveld's *Bibliographical Guide to Old English* has likewise escaped the author's attention.

<sup>1</sup> Besides the articles in *American Speech*, the following important publications — among others — have been omitted: Trnka, *On the Syntax of the English Verb from Caxton to Dryden* (Prague 1930; publ. 1931); Stern, *Meaning and Change of Meaning, with special reference to the English language* (Göteborg; publ. Nov. 1931); Fischer's article on American English in *Handbuch der Amerikakunde*, one of the best expositions of the subject. The same author's *Die Englische Literatur der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika (Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft)* is ignored in the introductory chapter on Literature, as is also the late Edwin Greenlaw's *The Province of Literary History*. What is even more surprising is that neither in this nor in the 1930 volume is there any reference to Professor Praz's *La Carne, la Morte e il Diavolo nella letteratura romantica* (now available in an English translation entitled *The Romantic Agony*), a work of such fundamental importance that *The Times Literary Supplement* devoted a leading article to it.

Several books and articles in these and other chapters are referred to as 'not available,' 'unobtainable,' etc. Were they applied for?



The chapter on 'Middle English,' by Miss Everett, is a very competent piece of work. One need not regret the absence of Looten's book on Chaucer; perhaps Hittmair's study of Caxton might have been mentioned.

The chapters on 'The Renaissance,' by F. S. Boas, and on 'Shakespeare,' by Allardyce Nicoll, are adequate, though undistinguished. One notes the absence of Schütt, *Englische Biographie der Tudorzeit*, and of Waldock's study of *Hamlet*. Mr. Doyle-Davidson's initials are W. A. G., not W. A. S. *Widman* should be *Widmann*; and the list of works that 'for various reasons' proved 'unobtainable,' is far too long.

Chapter VII on 'Elizabethan Drama,' again by F. S. Boas, contains useful accounts of publications not easily available to the private student, such as Greg's *Dramatic Documents from the Elizabethan Playhouses*, and *The Malone Society Collections*. Heller's *Faust and Faustus, a Study of Goethe's Relation to Marlowe* is omitted; so is Professor Praz's article on Marlowe in the December number of *E. S.*, and Dr. B. A. P. van Dam's study of R. Greene's *Alphonsus* in the June number of the same year.

The next chapter, on 'The Elizabethan Period: Poetry and Prose' is by three different hands, and, perhaps in consequence of this, just a little dry. Nothing is said of the new edition of Henry More's *Philosophical Poems*. By contrast, Allardyce Nicoll's short chapter on 'The Restoration' makes more lively reading.

For the four chapters on the seventeenth century, by as many contributors, there is only one on the eighteenth, but Miss Morley has seen to it that this century gets its due; the chapter is one of the longest in the volume. Indeed, some might think that it gets even more than its due. Surely only the most rabid Johnsonian will deny that to devote more than five pages to the Private Papers of James Boswell, and then another four to a catalogue of the same, hardly bespeaks a proper sense of proportion. An irritating feature of this chapter is that the same writer is discussed in widely different places; thus Burns is dealt with on pp. 228-230, and again on pp. 247-248; for Defoe one has to turn to pages 244, 256, 258, 262/3 and 264. In contrast with the leisurely opening of the chapter are the catalogues of titles on pp. 262 and 264; such lists had better be left to the *Annual Bibliography*. On the other hand, there are important omissions, such as Dottin's *Richardson and Reesink's L'Angleterre et la littérature anglaise dans les trois plus anciens périodiques français de Hollande de 1684 à 1709*; though here Miss Morley shares the blame with Professor Nicoll. Bosker's *Literary Criticism in the Age of Johnson* was overlooked in 1930, nor is it referred to in the current volume. Three of the articles in the *Defoe Memorial Number* of *E. S.* are mentioned by title; there is no further indication of their contents, and the mistake in the title of Prof. Praz's article 'Defoe et Cellini' makes it almost certain that they were copied from the *Review of English Studies*, whose bibliographer made the same slip. Again, the mere registering of titles should be left to the *A. B.*

Editorial oversight seems to have been lacking in some of these chapters; more than once the same book is reviewed twice (pp. 215 & 230, and again 238 & 267), though the Index, for some inscrutable reason, saves appearances by recording it only once.

The chapter on 'The Nineteenth Century and After,' in two sections, both by H. V. Routh, calls for little comment. Farmer's *Le Mouvement esthétique et 'décadent' en Angleterre (1879-1900)* is omitted; so is Fairchild, *The*

*Romantic Quest*. Spindler's work on *Robert Browning und die Antike* appeared in 1930; the reader is left to infer that it was published the year after. Praz's article on Hazlitt, and Kooistra's on Aldous Huxley (E. S., Febr. & Oct. 1931) appear to be unknown to Mr. Routh; in fact, contrary to former years, the literary contributions to *English Studies* for 1931 seem to have got mislaid on the editor's desk, though the linguistic contents are duly noticed.

The usual chapter on 'Bibliographica' concludes the volume.

The index contains a few inaccuracies: Audra, E., *L'Influence française dans l'œuvre de Pope*, should have been added; the comma after *Indeed*, p. 330, first column, sixth line from below, should be a semicolon; Wood, F. T., and Wood, Frederick, listed separately, are in reality one and the same person.

In the Index to the 1930 volume mistakes are more numerous. We have noted Sannazarro for Sannazaro (p. 382), Bastienen for Bastiaenen, Dorocquigny for Derocquigny, Langenhoue for Langenhove; even Jespersen's name has become Jespersen. The surname of the author of *Daniel Defoe: Essay on Projects* is Jacob, not Gerhard. Two of these errors also occur in the text. Towards the end of the letter P the alphabetical order has gone wrong. Surely, if the professional indexer can do no better than this, anonymity would be preferable.

Just as *The Year's Work* supplements the monthly and other periodical reviews, the *Annual Bibliography* supplements *The Year's Work*. Completeness and accuracy of detail are the chief tests by which it is to be judged, though the principle of classification adopted is of scarcely less importance. On the whole, the line of demarcation between 'Language' and 'Literature' — 'Philology' as a heading is fortunately eschewed in the A. B. — is more scrupulously observed than in the Y. W.<sup>1</sup>; but it is doubtful whether the arrangement of the sections would commend itself in every respect to the compiler of a purely linguistic survey. The principal drawback is that, apart from the sub-section 'Grammars,' no historical classification has been attempted; items concerning Old, Middle and Modern English are given pell-mell, the alphabetical sequence of the authors' names being the only guide. Then, while there is a special section for American English, there is none for American Literature, which is treated as indistinguishable from English. The chapter entitled 'General' is almost as much of a lumber-room as those in the Y. W.; in the 1931 volume the items are about equally divided between twentieth-century American 'humanism' and ... librarianship. Since 1923, anthologies, apart from period anthologies, have not been separately listed, but included under 'Literary History,' which seems a distinct disadvantage.

Whether it would be easy to remedy these defects, if defects they are, is another question. Once a reference work has run into a dozen annual volumes, any departure from what has become a traditional classification is apt to be resented by regular users, and compilers will be reluctant to make important changes, unless the resultant gain clearly outweighs the user's

<sup>1</sup> Misplacements do occur, however. Funke's *Zum Weltsprachenproblem in England im 17. Jahrhundert* is given under 'Literature' (Bibl. 1930, 1732; 1931, 1972); the same has happened to Leonard's *The Doctrine of Correctness in English, 1700-1800* (Bibl. 1930, 2006; 1931, 2315). Conversely, an article entitled 'Why Study Literature?' has strayed into 'English Language, General' (Bibl. 1930, 228)! This list could be extended.

discomfort. So it is with some diffidence that we submit these criticisms to the editor's consideration.

Errors and omissions are a different matter, of course. The reviewer confesses himself responsible for the omission of two Dutch items in the 1929 volume: SWAEN, A. E. H. *Bijdrage tot de Angelsaksische Lexicographie*. *Donum Natalicium* Schrijnen, 533-535. (insert after 297) — and: Church] POMPEN, A. *De Oorsprong van het Woord kerk*. *Bibliographische Aanteekeningen*. *Donum Natalicium* Schrijnen, 516-532. (insert after 318) — both of which only recently came to his notice. In this connection it may be asked if it would not be advisable to distinguish such omissions, when repaired in a subsequent volume, by special type from entries belonging to the year covered by that volume. The same holds good with respect to reviews of works published in previous years. At present, any page of the *A. B.* for, say, 1931, may, and usually does, contain three different kinds of entries: a. books and articles published in 1931; b. reviews of books published in any previous year; c. books and articles omitted from any previous volume. An arrangement by which one could see at a glance what are new publications and what belong to former years, would probably commend itself to most users of the *Bibliography*, without involving any serious change of system.

The number of errors is comparatively small. Of misprints (or miswritings) we note *Sophonistragödien* for *Sophonisbetragödien* in *Bibl.* 1930, 1762 & 2024; *Andra* instead of *Audra*, *Bibl.* 1931, 2570, 4048 and *Index*. — *Bibl.* 1931, 1150, *Vertald* should be *Vertaald*, and *Willink* should be preceded by *Tjeenk*. — *Ibid.*, 1170, is mutilated; the title should read: *Die Funktionen des Erzählers* in Chaucer's epischer Dichtung. — One wonders why the *R(évue de) L(ittérature) C(omparée)* is not included in the List of Abbreviations. — An Amsterdam dissertation (*Bibl.* 1930, 1768) is independently listed as published by a New York firm under 705; another double entry occurs *Bibl.* 1930, 853 and 1522. In the same volume, Sir William Temple has been transferred to the eighteenth century (2027); in the *Index* he is identified with one William Johnston Temple, whose *Diaries*, 1780-1796, were published in 1929. — Curme's note on the Origin of the Accusative often used as a Subject of the Gerund, in *E. Studies*, 1930, was not reviewed, but merely commented on by the late Fritz Karpf in *E. Studien* LXV, 333-4; no. 559, *Bibl.* 1931, should, therefore, be cancelled; the supposed review is correctly registered under no. 571, to which should only be added a reference to *Bibl.* 1930, 504. — No. 933, *Bibl.* 1931, is a second edition. — 1261 does not belong to Old and Middle English. — 4072 should be transferred, or at least referred, to a place between 1878 and 1879.

\* \* \*

We began by calling these reference works indispensable; we are afraid we must end by expressing a suspicion that too many students of English, in Holland at least, continue to dispense with them. But then, judging by the contents of our periodicals, the younger generation in this country, apart from a few academic theses, seem to dispense with productive research work altogether, and so can hardly be expected to take much interest in the work of others.

Watchman, what of the night?

The Hague.

R. W. ZANDVOORT.



*The Place-Names of Devon.* By J. E. B. GOVER, A. MAWER & F. M. STENTON. (English Place-Name Society, vol. VIII & IX). lx + 754 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1931—1932. 40 sh.

Devonshire is a remarkably interesting land, because it is so purely English. As ought to be expected, the county is almost completely free from Scandinavian influence. But it is rather surprising to find that its nomenclature owes so little to the Celtic element. A few river names, here and there the name of a Cornish or Irish saint (p. 75 *Stoke*, formerly *Nectanestoke*, from the Irish saint *Nechtan*), a very small number of common nouns or stems borrowed from neighbouring Cornwall: this would be a nearly complete list of the Celtic peculiarities the Editors have been able to discover. The fact is explained as follows. The Saxon settlement is not earlier than 658, not a very recent date, but still late in comparison with many other counties. The original population must have been very thin in former times, whereas personal names preserved in place-names often point to the XIth century and later, so that it can be safely admitted that the intense colonisation of Devon did not begin very early. As to the dialect, it is a real comfort to the student of Old English to find so many relics of good old West Saxon. After having devoted one's time and pains to learn that form of Old English, most of us were obliged to unlearn it as soon as they turned to Middle English. In Devon at least the *c*'s of *cold* and *calf* are properly palatalised, many details of the vocalism are only explicable when starting from the W. Sax. vowels, and the treatment of *sc*, which is still *sk* in many examples, without any possible Scandinavian influence, is a good warning against rash generalisations of phonetic laws. The impression of a very archaic language is emphasized still more by the preservation of numerous traces of OE inflexion in place-names, dative singular, genitive plural, etc. This is far from common in England. Many place-names are manorial, i.e. must be referred to surnames, mostly Norman-French or continental in origin, belonging to the owners of manors. This is a striking feature in Devonshire and is due to the recent character of most settlements in the county, in accordance with the general impression of the nomenclature. — The county being a vast one, the number of names discussed is extremely large, about 7500 (excluding field-names) and the two maps of North and South Devon form quite a volume by themselves.

The Editors have been well inspired to include street names in their lists (Exeter, Barnstaple, Plymouth...), always a very interesting subject. *Calenderhay* (Exeter) reminds one of the *Calandeberg*, *Calanderberg* in Ghent, the origin of which must be sought, it seems, in a confraternity or a carousal (MDu *calende*, *calender*, cognate with Fr. *chaland*, customer). The *Rue de Joie* at Liège is said to have its name from a band (Walloon *djowe*, from an equivalent of Fr. *jouer*, to play (music), confused with *djoye*, joy). Perhaps comparisons of the kind can throw some light on the origin of *Joy Street*, etc. — In Devonshire names containing *cumb*, *dūn*, *hyll*, *lēah*, etc. are very numerous but, as elsewhere, *tūn* outnumbers all its competitors. *Hām* is almost unknown, except in a few cases where *hamm* is as likely, *cot* is well represented and *hay* (OE *gehæg*, enclosure) is a characteristic of the county. I am rather sceptical about *Bourton*, *Buraton*, *Burrington*, which are supposed to contain an OE *būr*, peasant. There is no such word on record, only *gebūr*, which is not the same thing, and in later times *boor* may be suspected of being borrowed from Du *boer*, itself a rather late development of (*ge*)*buur*. Still worse is the case of *\*sacuman* "litigious person", a word

unknown in OE, represented by *Sakemanneston*, now *Seckington* (p. 358). I cannot but consider the explanation very improbable. *Luscott* p. 33 gives weight to the opinion that *lūs*, louse, in place-names is an equivalent for miserable, while *Musbury* (p. 646) seems to be a "*burh*" frequented only by mice, i.e. a deserted spot. *Quoditch*, p. 127, and *Quither* 216 are referred to OE *cwēad*, dung, dirt. This is no doubt right, but the term is also an adjective in ME, so that a translation "bad house" (*ærn*) for *Quither* and "land of little value" for *Quoditch*, instead of "well-manured land" remains possible. Conversely, *kwaad* in Du place-names is perhaps a substantive where modern ears are inclined to feel an adjective "bad". Comparisons with Du place-names or toponymical elements are of course numerous in these two volumes. *Morthoe* (p. 52 seq.) and other names beginning with *mort-* are explained by Eng. Dial. *murt*, "small person", and cognate words. I ventured for *Mortsel* (four different places of a similar form are known in Flanders) the assumption of *mord* or *morþ* (Swed. *morb*, E. Fris. *murt*, Swiss *murz*) in the sense of gravel (*Bull. de la Commission de Topon. et Dialectologie*, VI, 33 seq.). Both interpretations are possible. *Hals* is not frequent in Dutch names, but the meaning "neck" seems well established by the English instances (except where *hals* means *hazel*, see I, p. lviii). Therefore it will be prudent to keep to the sense "neck" for *Herenthals* (Antwerp) and similar names, even if we cannot see what kind of neck is meant. River-names are always a great difficulty. I should consider *Alphin* (p. 1) a genuine name, not a back-formation, in view of *rivus Alfene* a° 1189 (*Teralfene*, not far from Brussels) or *Alphen* (N. Brab.), *Alfen* (Geld.). In that case *Alphington* might owe its name to the stream. *Five*, *Vive*, is the name of a brook in Flanders (*O. Gent. Naamk.* 195), which might be cognate with *Viveham*, p. 39. *La Beme*, *Beme*, is identical with *Boom* (near Antwerp) "at the Tree" (p. 123). *Appledore* (p. 626 etc., several places) is identical with Du *Apeldoorn* (Geld.). *Hakeford* p. 69 cannot be separated from the continental places containing *hake*, no doubt "OE *haca*, bolt, used in some topographical sense" (l.c.), though denominations as *Hakedover* (Brab.), *Sippenaken*, *Vissenaeken*, etc. give little help as to the original meaning of *hake*. *Pudeford*, now *Great Pitford* (p. 374) is not necessarily corrupt for *Pitte-*, *Putte-*, but can be referred to MDu *pude*, a frog.

An overwhelming majority of place-names are derived from personal names, the list filling more than six pages (681—687). The greater part are formed by pet-names of the "meaningless" type as *Dodda*, *Potta*, *Totta*, *Tucc*, *Wade*, etc. The existence of these cannot be doubted, but the explanation by such names may seem to some readers a too easy way of solving all place-name puzzles whatever. The difficulty is a real one, because it is impossible to prove the existence of an obscure person called *Dodda* or *Totta* in a definite place except by the name of the place itself. On the other hand pet-names of the kind are derived also from place-names or tribal names — this was pointed out among others by d'Arbois de Jubainville. I am not prepared to reject the interpretation of place-names by personal names in general, far from it. But one must confess that operating with personal names in toponymic questions is often groping in the dark, because of the uncertainty of the matter. A good theory of onomatology in general, with special reference to West-Germanic, is badly needed.

*The Wheel of Fire*, Essays in Interpretation of Shakespeare's Sombre Tragedies. By G. WILSON KNIGHT. Oxford University Press, London, Milford, 1930. Pp. xx + .296. Price 12/6 net.

*The Imperial Theme*, Further Interpretations of Shakespeare's Tragedies including the Roman Plays. By G. WILSON KNIGHT. *Ibid.*, 1931, Pp. xii + 367. Price 12/6 net.

*The Shakespearian Tempest*. By G. WILSON KNIGHT. *Ibid.*, 1932. Pp. x + 332. Price 12/6 net.

Whatever one may think of Prof. Wilson Knight's much discussed volumes on Shakespeare, I suppose all will agree in recognizing their importance as an attempt to react against recent investigation of a disintegrating character, and at the same time as an application to literary criticism, or rather to a field consecrated to traditional methods, of tendencies of thought which can be termed modern in the fullest sense of this word. The essay *On the Principles of Shakespeare Interpretation* (in *The Wheel of Fire*) is essential to our understanding of the critic's point of view. Prof. Wilson Knight distinguishes between criticism and interpretation: the former having an external character, of a judgement of the value of a work considered side by side with others; the latter based on an original acceptance of the validity of the poetic unit which it claims to translate into discursive reasoning, without recourse to qualitative criteria. The following passage is significant enough :

'Intentions belong to the plane of intellect and memory: the swifter consciousness that awakes in poetic composition touches subtleties and heights and depths unknowable by intellect and intractable to memory. That consciousness we can enjoy at will when we submit ourselves with utmost passivity to the poet's work; but when the intellectual mode returns it often brings with it a troop of concepts irrelevant to the nature of the work it thinks to analyse, and, with its army of 'intentions', 'sources', and 'characters', and its essentially ethical outlook, works havoc with our minds, since it is trying to impose on the vivid reality of art a logic totally alien to its nature. ...Reference to the artist's 'intentions' is usually a sign that the commentator... has lost touch with the essentials of the poetic work. He is thinking in terms of the time-sequence and causality, instead of allowing his mind to be purely receptive... Next as to 'Sources'. This concept is closely involved with that of 'intentions'. Both try to explain art in terms of causality, the most natural implement of intellect. Both fail empirically to explain any essential whatsoever.

One can easily see in this passage the influence of Bergson's philosophy, and, more generally, of the anti-intellectual bias of the modern romantics, such as D. H. Lawrence and some American novelists. We can venture even a step further, and say that the passive attitude recommended by Prof. Wilson Knight to the interpreter, so that he should trust the immediate reaction of his mind, is strongly reminiscent of the attitude psycho-analysts urge on their patients, and of the principle of *écriture automatique* of French *surréalistes*.

What Prof. Wilson Knight actually does is to read Shakespeare in the light of to-day's thought and emotions; a legitimate enough standpoint, if we agree with Croce in calling all history 'contemporary', in so far as seen in the light of contemporary interests and problems, or if we agree with Prof. Lascelles Abercrombie's theory of criticism.

At the same time, Prof. Wilson Knight's method is very much like the



more advanced method in art criticism, which discounts the descriptive elements of a picture (its intellectual background), to concentrate solely on pictorial values (such as chromatic, tactile values): the non-intellectual elements being represented in the case of poetry by certain symbols and images calculated to appeal to our intuitional powers. In this respect Prof. Wilson Knight pushes to its extreme consequences a method that has become increasingly popular in modern, chiefly English, critics, under the stimulus of the study of metaphysical poetry, which has had as a consequence the stressing of the importance of imagery (I refer to such works as Prof. Spurgeon's lecture on *Leading Motives in the Imagery of Shakespeare's Tragedies*, 1930, upon which Prof. Wilson Knight draws, to *Shakespeare's Iterative Imagery*, 1931, another lecture by Prof. Spurgeon,<sup>1</sup> to Miss Elizabeth Holmes's *Aspects of Elizabethan Imagery*, 1929, which, however, is not referred to by the American critic, etc.).

I shall select one instance only among the copious illustrations of this method we find in Prof. Wilson Knight's book: his very remarkable essay on *Coriolanus* (in *The Imperial Theme*). Very skilfully the critic calls attention to the metallic imagery of the play: "We are limited by city walls. And cities are here metallic, our world constricted, bound in by hard walls." Another set of images refers to 'disease'; and the 'mechanic' and 'city' imagery blends frequently with 'body' imagery, creating a strong impression of what, in default of a better word, I would call 'constipation': in fact, if I am allowed to continue on my own account Prof. Wilson Knight's trend of thought, *Coriolanus's* tragedy is the tragedy of a soul constipated by pride. How far Shakespeare's imagery was influenced by the famous apologue of Menenius Agrippa, which he quotes, does not concern us here, since we are warned against laying stress on sources. But let us consider the following passage (p. 191):

But these two, Volumnia and Coriolanus, have loved parochially, provincially, among the grey slated roofs, the pipes and conduits, the stony roads and walls, of this metallic, urban, exclusive setting. They, too, have been exclusive, iron-fenced from contact with their unhonoured inferiors.

Now, this description suggests powerfully one of those visions of the classical world which have become famous (at least among highbrows) through the paintings of Giorgio De Chirico. Prof. Wilson Knight's *Coriolanus* (whether or not he knows De Chirico's paintings) is first of all De Chirico's, i.e. a contemporary, *Coriolanus*. Whether he is also Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* is what we moderns cannot perhaps well decide, and, in a way, the question loses interest if we claim Prof. Lascelles Abercrombie's "liberty of interpreting", or Croce's "contemporary" idea of history.

This instance of Prof. Wilson Knight's interpretation is, I think, attractive enough: it stimulates, if nothing else, our understanding of the play. Most of times, however, Prof. Wilson Knight seems to me to discard an abstraction in favour of another which has not even the merit of modernity. We may agree with him when he says (p. 19—20):

To devote excessive attention to 'characters' is, indeed, fatal. The 'character' cannot be abstracted from those imaginative effects of poetry and poetic-drama

<sup>1</sup> Miss Spurgeon's contention is less ambitious than Prof. Wilson Knight's. She writes: "It is quite clear that it is Shakespeare's habit of mind to have before him, as he writes, some picture or symbol, which recurs again and again in the form of images throughout a play; ..... these leading motives, for instance in the tragedies, are born of the emotions of the theme, and shed considerable light on the way Shakespeare himself looked at it."

of which he is composed. That is to abstract him from himself and thus create a pure abstraction..... The persons of Shakespeare are compact of poetic colour, poetic association, and are, moreover, defined as much by what happens to them or is said of them as by what they do and say... The action is not decorated with images: the images are the action.

But when he proceeds to see the plays as contrasts between kingship, warrior-honour, love, order, etc., we seem to be taken back to the conventions of the Spanish and French theatre of the seventeenth century, and of Dryden's stage. I do not think we are much advanced when we have found out that in *Hamlet* and in many of the following plays, "love and all 'honour' values are ranged together against the instruments of darkness": in this tendency to abstract personifications, I think, lies one of the dangers of Prof. Wilson Knight's theory, a danger which is clearly indicated by his use of capital letters (chiefly in *The Wheel of Fire*) for the names of those 'values'. But, after all, the critic is not so averse to the study of characters as he purports to be; for what else but such studies are his remarkable pages on Hamlet in *The Wheel of Fire* and on Cleopatra in *The Imperial Theme*? (By the way, his interpretation of Hamlet as evil, death, negation, as the embodiment of destructive, inhuman, intellect, whereas the other characters of that play "are of humanity, with all its failings, it is true, but yet of humanity", is very much in accordance with D. H. Lawrence's conception of life).

On the whole, Prof. Wilson Knight's volumes are rather unequal: he shows at times extraordinary insight into poetic imagination, at other times his associations seem to be no less personal than those of T. S. Eliot's *Waste Land* (a poem whose technique may have influenced him), and, occasionally, he is capable of platitudes and tiresome repetitions (this latter defect he has in common with D. H. Lawrence). I am afraid the last of his books (*The Shakespearian Tempest*) shows more his defects than his qualities. He sees in the tempest-music opposition the principle underlying the whole Shakespearian world. He proceeds to collect river, sea, and tempest references in Shakespeare, studies the tempest-beast association, etc. Winds and waves are in Shakespeare usually things cruel and relentless, etc. All mortal insecurity is a matter of tempests. Since sea storms are so constantly the poetic image correspondent to human tragedies, the party or individual which suffers disaster is continually thought of as a boat or 'bark', etc. One feels surprised that Prof. Wilson Knight should call this type of metaphors "typical" of Shakespeare (in fact, if we applied to the writings of the critic his own method, we should say, by the frequency with which the word occurs in his pages, that he is obsessed by the idea of what is "typical"), and on the other hand one feels no less surprised on hearing him say (p. 40, footnote) that "It is the same with us all. Any one can understand Shakespeare's symbolism". As a matter of fact expressions like "a sea of woes", comparisons of human anger and its grim effects to beasts and tempests, and so on, can hardly be called symbolical. Those images are like defaced coins; they have lost all suggestive power through immemorial use. If they are typical at all, they are rather typical of Petrarca than of Shakespeare, into whose vocabulary they had crept through the well-known channel of Italianate influence. Any of the poets of the French *Pléiade* might be analysed from the point of view from which Prof. Wilson Knight analyses Shakespeare here. There is a famous sonnet of Petrarca which Prof. Wilson Knight does not seem to take into account, or, knowing it, would not take into account, because he is not interested in sources :

Passa la nave mia colma d' obbligo  
 Per aspro mare a mezza notte il verno  
 Infra Scilla e Cariddi; ed al governo  
 Siede 'l signor, anzi 'l nemico mio.  
 A ciascun remo un pensier pronto e rio,  
 Che la tempesta e 'l fin par ch'abbia a schermo ;  
 La vela rompe un vento umido eterno  
 Di sospir, di speranze e di desio.  
 Pioggia di lagrimar, nebbia di sdegni  
 Bagna e rallenta le già stanche sarte,  
 Che son d' error con ignoranza attorto.  
 Celansi i duo miei dolci usati segni;  
 Morta fra l' onde è la ragion e l'arte :  
 Tal ch' incomincio a disperar del porto.

Apropos of a passage in *Romeo and Juliet* (III. v. 131) which derives ultimately from this sonnet, by way of Ercole Strozzi and of Thomas Watson's *Passionate Centurie of Love* (lxxxv), Prof. Wilson Knight says that that passage "shows how powerful and exact may be this tempest and bark imagery as applied to the soul's distress" (p. 47). Apart from the fact that such adjectives as "powerful" and "exact" seem rather wasted on what is after all only a pedantic emblem, that tempest is not a "Shakespearian", but rather a "Petrarchan Tempest."<sup>1</sup> And when he states (p. 53) that

the sea may be charged with varied significance. It may register indecision... Generally tempestuous, it is a symbol of death, disorder; but calm, it may be, correspondingly, the stage set for prosperity, success, and love.....

we may wonder whether he is talking of poetry at all, or, rather, of fortune cards. That so much in Prof. Wilson Knight's last volume reminds us of fortune-telling should not, I think, discompose him, seeing that fortune cards play such an important part in T. S. Eliot's *Waste Land*, which I am sure we both admire.

Manchester.

MARIO PRAZ.

*Shakespeare's Sonnetten*, vertaald door J. DECROOS. Uitgave „Steenland", Kortrijk. 1932.

Dr. Decroos' vertaling van de Shakespeare-sonnetten verdient een ernstige bespreking. Niet alleen omdat zulk een volledige vertaling zeldzaam is — wij bezaten, als ik me niet vergis, alleen die van Burgersdijk — maar ook omdat de vertaler, die al meer 16de eeuwsch engelsch in het nederlandsch overbracht, de taal van het oorspronkelijk verstaat en zich van ieder woord rekenschap gegeven heeft. Dit wil niet zeggen dat hij goed vertaalde, daarvoor is nog heel wat meer noodig, maar het beduidt dat hij het zich niet gemakkelijk gemaakt heeft, dat hij inderdaad trachtte te vertalen, en niet zondigde door gebrek aan taalkennis of luiheid van begrip. Men doet zelfs

<sup>1</sup> But see p. 275: "Dante loads his *Inferno*, in canto after canto, with imagery of wrecks, tempests, whirlwinds, foul air, mud, bloody rivers, fiery rain, torrents, cataracts, and earthquakes: all these are Shakespearian." I fail to grasp this conclusion.



het best hem allereerst te zien als iemand die de sonnetten begrijpen, ja verklaren wou, en die ook bij zijn vertalen het verklaren niet geheel op zij kon schuiven. Hij legt uit en kan het dan niet helpen als hij zijn uitleg in de plaats schuift van het onuitgelegde oorspronkelijk. Zoo, waar Shakespeare begint (nr. XCIV):

*They that have power to hurt and will do none,*

zegt Dr. Decroos :

*Wie harten winnen kan doch kaapt er geen.*

Zoo ook vertaalt hij (nr. CXXX) Shakespeare's „black wires” met „zwarte draad — geen gouddraad —”, en (uit nr. CXXXI) zijn „so as thou art” met „Doch schoon of niet,” en kan het niet laten de obscene uitdrukkingen van Sonnet CLI nog wat aan te dikken, uit vrees dat de lezer ze anders niet zou opmerken. Dit zijn duidelijke voorbeelden, maar ook waar men ze niet zoo kan aanwijzen is er de bedoeling vooral uit te leggen.

Een groot gevaar bij een dergelijke geesteshouding ligt hierin, dat men in een andere toon vervalt dan die Shakespeare aansloeg, en dan allicht in een minderwaardige toon. Een sterk voorbeeld daarvan is de vertaling van de prachtige regel, waarmee Sonnet XL begint :

*Take all my loves, my love, yea take them all.*

Men schrikt als men daarvoor leest :

*Kaap al mijn liefjes, vriend, 't is u gegund.*

Daar is de toon van de laaggestemde verklaarder zoo geheel voor die van de dichter in de plaats gedrongen, dat men zich afwendt en vraagt of deze vertaler, in zijn streven om alles goed te begrijpen, het beste niet heeft misverstaan.

Want dit is de groote fout van de heele vertaling: telkens weer ontbreekt de vanzelfsprekende, de bij de gedachte behoorende, toonval van het oorspronkelijk. Als Shakespeare zegt (nr. IX):

*Is it for fear to wet a widow's eye  
That thou consum'st thyself in single life ?*

dan heeft die vraag haar natuurlijke wending. Maar als de vertaler dit weergeeft door :

*Uit vreeze dat een weeuw eens traanoog', slijt  
Ge zonder bedgenoot aldus uw dagen ?*

dan is dezelfde vraag van een paskwillige onnatuurlijkheid. Toch is dit voorbeeld niet een uitzondering, maar een billijk staal van de hier gegeven verzenstijl. Dr. Decroos heeft noch oor, noch takt, noch natuurlijke woordkeus. Van Shakespeare's vers met zijn zeer sterke cesuren heeft hij niets begrepen, noch van zijn stijl die berust op parallelisme en antithese. Die eigenschappen van vers en stijl versterken elkaar, zooals natuurlijk is, en ze zetten zich door tot in de klanken, in assonanties en alliteraties. Wie dit niet begrijpt, wie dit niet voelt — want dit begrijpen is in de eerste plaats een voelen — en toch de sonnetten vertalen wil, vergrijpt er zich aan. Te erger

naarmate hij nadrukkelijker in zijn eigen vers en zijn eigen woordkeus zijn verstandelijk begrip ervan op rijm wil brengen. Dr. Decroos is soms meer Shakespeare dan Shakespeare. Tenminste dat meent hij. Hij gebruikt dan gewaagde uitdrukkingen, sterk-reële beelden. Dat doet Shakespeare immers ook. Maar waar zij bij de dichter het juiste woord zijn, taktvol aangebracht, zijn ze bij de vertaler altijd ernaast en altijd onsmakvol. Als het engelsch heeft (nr. LXXXIV)

Lean penury within that pen doth dwell  
That to his subject lends not some small glory,

dan is het schijnbaar Shakespeariaansch in het nederlandsch van een „ellendig lendenmaagre stift” te gewagen. Als Shakespeare (nr. CXXVIII) van toetsen, die benijd worden omdat ze de hand van een geliefde raken, als van „saucy jacks” spreekt, dan gaat het juist iets over de schreef daarvan „houten stouterds” te maken. Als (nr. CXLI) van: „tender feeling to base touches prone” gesproken wordt, dan is „t wulpsch gevoel dat dartel-nipplend tast” een onsmakvolle uitbreiding.

Het zou onbillijk zijn niet te erkennen dat men kwatrijnen ontmoet die het oorspronkelijk duidelijk en eenvoudig weergeven en in grooter aantal losse regels waarop niets valt aan te merken, maar even waar is het dat men zelden een geheel sonnet met voldoening lezen kan. De verkeerde eigenschappen van de vertaler doen zich telkens op de een of andere wijs opmerken.

Die eigenschappen liggen ten deele ook in zijn gebrek aan schrijvers-vermogen en in zijn onvermogen verzen te schrijven. Shakespeare's sonnetten berusten altijd op een meervoudige gedachtegang. Soms bedient die gedachtegang zich van een eenvoudig, aan de werkelijkheid ontleend beeld. De deelen van de voorstelling blijven dan duidelijk zichtbaar en moeten door de vertaler worden vastgehouden. Zoo bevat nr. CXVII een voorstelling die meer in de sonnetten voorkomt, namelijk eene die aan de rechtspraak ontleend is. Aanklacht, vonnis en beroep worden achtereenvolgens ter sprake gebracht. In de vertaling verdwijnt al dadelijk 't technische „Accuse me” achter het zedelijke „Beticht me” en het woord „appeal” uit de slotregels is geheel verloren gegaan. Een soortgelijk bezwaar is te maken tegen de vertaling van nr. LXI. Daarin bestaat de constructie uit het verband: „Is it *thy* will — Doest *thou* desire — Is it *thy* spirit — O no — It is *my* love.” Deze eenvoudige en heldere volgorde is in het nederlandsch niet tot haar recht gekomen, hoewel men ziet dat de bewerker er oog voor had. Talloos zijn de plaatsen waar moeilijkheden met rijm of maat een zin bederven die de vertaler toch wel degelijk begrepen heeft. Gaat dit bederf niet te ver, dan wil men het licht vergeven, maar er zijn afwijkingen die ongeoorloofd zijn. Zoo, als in nr. XI het huwen wordt aanbevolen met de woorden :

Herein lives wisdom, beauty and increase, —

dan ligt het indrukwekkende juist in die drieslag van gelijk-gearde, in dit geval *abstracte* woorden. Dit te vertalen met:

Daarin is wijsheid, schoonheid, *weelge telgen*,

verraadt een zoodanige omkeering van dichterlijke en taalwaarden dat geen schrijver ze zich vergunnen moest.

Had de vertaler een bewerking in proza geschreven, dan zou hij zijn lezers

meer gebaat hebben. Juist daarom zal ik ten besluite enkele plaatsen aantekenen waar ik mij met zijn opvatting niet kan vereenigen of waar ik meen dat hij de zin misverstond.

Daar is in de eerste plaats Sonnet LXXVII. Er is daarin sprake van een spiegel, een klok, witte bladen en een boek. Dr. Decroos zegt in zijn desbetreffende aantekening dat deze vier voorwerpen door de dichter aan zijn vriend geschonken werden. Hij ziet voorbij dat in de tekst van „*Thy glass*” en „*Thy dial*”, in duidelijke onderscheiding van „*The vacant leaves*” en „*this book*” gesproken wordt. Hij ziet het voorbij en doet het ook in zijn tekst niet uitkomen. Hij schuift zijn uitleg onder, door niet van „uw” te spreken, maar van „de” en „het”. Dit schijnt mij niet een betwistbare opvatting, maar een tastbare onjuistheid. Een opvatting, maar waarmee ik mij niet kan vereenigen, is de meening dat het boek en de witte bladen twee verschillende voorwerpen zouden zijn. Dit is, tegenover ’t oorspronkelijk, een verdedigbare gissing, maar ook de opvatting dat „*vacant leaves*” en „*this book*” hetzelfde zijn, blijft verdedigbaar. In de vertaling staat niet de tekst, maar een uitleg, die betwistbaar is. Evenzoo schijnt het me met nr. CXXV gesteld. De gedachtegang daarvan is de verontwaardigde uiting: „Heb ik ooit uiterlijke grootheid gezocht? Heb ik niet al te zeer ervaren dat zij die dat deden tot een slecht eind kwamen? Neen, nederig in uw hart wil ik dienen en u, in ruil voor uzelf, mijzelf geven. Vanhier, gij listige aanklager! een oprechte ziel staat, wanneer ze ergst beschuldigd wordt, minst onder uw heerschappij.” Ik kan niet inzien dat die aanklager iets anders gezegd heeft dan dat hij, de dichter, zijn vriend om uiterlijk voordeel zocht. De lezing, door dr. Decroos in een aantekening voorgestaan, dat namelijk de aanklager zijn vriend van afnemende schoonheid beschuldigd had, schijnt me met de tekst niet in overeenstemming. In zijn aantekening gaat de schrijver nog verder. Hij leest dat een dergelijke aanklacht het minst gevaarlijk voor de vriend is, nu ze zoo openlijk wordt uitgesproken; en voor deze lezing worden dan, op een wonderlijke wijs, de slotregels van het sonnet pasklaar gemaakt. Het is mij tenminste niet duidelijk dat de verzen:

Hence, thou suborn'd informer! a true soul  
When most impeach'd stands least in thy control —

billijk vertaald zouden zijn met:

Weg, trouwlooze overdrager, want rechtschaapnen  
Duchten, als gij hen aanvalt, 't minst uw wapnen.

Een derde opvatting waarmee ik mij niet kan vereenigen is de lezing „*A maiden hue*” in plaats van „*A man in hue*” (Sonnet XX). De tekst is moeilijk, maar ik ben nog niet overtuigd dat hij bedorven is. In de eerste twee regels van dit Sonnet zegt Shakespeare dat zijn vriend „*a woman's face*” heeft, in de twee volgende „*A woman's gentle heart*”, maar minder wisselziek, in de dan volgende bespreekt hij zijn oog:

An eye more bright than theirs, less false in rolling,  
Gilding the object whereupon it gazeth;  
A man in hue, all „hues” in his controlling,  
Which steals men's eyes and women's souls amazeth.

De zinsbouw in aanmerking genomen, kan dit niet anders beteekenen dan dat het oog van de vriend, behalve 't andere waardoor het 't vrouwenoog overtreft,



ook „a man in hue” is. Dit is vreemd, maar niet ondenkbaar. Daarentegen wordt door de emendatie „A maiden hue” de verheffing boven de vrouw, die klaarblijkelijk bedoeld is, plotseling losgelaten voor haar tegendeel. Dit is een anti-climax die ik niet kan aannemen.

Regels waartegen ik bezwaar maak zijn o.a. in nr. VII, waar het vers:

Resembling strong youth in his middle age,

niet vertaald zou moeten worden met:

Een stoeren man gelijk in rijper jaren,

maar met: „op zijn middelbare leeftijd een sterk jongeling gelijkende”. Ook in nr. CIX, waar :

So that myself bring water for my stain

m.i. niet wil zeggen:

Door boetetranen wordt mijn hart weer kuisch,

maar enkel dat zijn tijdige en onveranderde terugkeer vanzelf de vlek van zijn afwezigheid uitwischt. Evenzoo geloof ik dat in nr. CX de bekende regel:

Made old offences of affections new

niet zeggen wil:

Met nieuwe neiging krenkte ik oude min,

maar: „nieuwe neigingen maakte ik (als vroeger) tot zonden.”

In het voorbijgaan wil ik hier aanstippen dat het herhaald gebruik van het woord „min”, voor Shakespeare's „love”, zoowel aan de klank als aan de natuurlijkheid schade doet.

Het is niet noodig kleinere afwijkingen van de tekst mee te deelen. Zij blijven uitzonderingen. Bovendien staat er tegenover dat sommige regels nauwkeuriger dan door andere, ook duitsche, vertalers werden overgebracht.

Dr. Decroos heeft de volgorde van Denis Bray overgenomen, zooals Burgersdijk het vroeger die van Bodenstein deed. Ik kan niet zeggen dat ze me bevredigt. Verschillende sonnetten die klaarblijkelijk bij elkaar behooren, worden erdoor gescheiden. Maar dit is een punt waarover ik alsnog niet ten volle durf oordeelen.

Noordwijk aan Zee.

ALBERT VERWEY.

*Hamlets Bühnenlaufbahn (1601—1877).* By WILHELM WIDMANN. 267 pp. Schriften der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft. Neue Folge, Band I. Tauchnitz, 1931. R.M. 14 or 16.50.

Written as a prize-essay in answer to a question of the Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, this work was to have been in two volumes, the second to contain the stage-history of *Hamlet* from ca. 1880 to our days. There were great

difficulties, however, in getting the book published, so that the author turned his attention to other subjects. He died before even having seen the first volume in print. This is now posthumously offered to the reading public through the care of Messrs. Joseph Schick and Werner Deetjen.

A stage-history comprises (a) a study of the texts played, (b) a description of the actual performers and performances. The author, being a stage-critic, seems to have been mainly interested in the second of these subjects. This part of his work is very fully elaborated, giving a long list of Shakespearean actors and actresses, most of them German, a fair number English or American, with a glance now and then at France and Holland. There is an account of the various stage-versions used in Germany, but this part of the work is somewhat meagre. So I suppose this stage-history may be read with profit by all Shakespeare actors. It will supply them with many a valuable hint as to the manner in which world-famous actors played the difficult part of the Prince of Denmark. The student of the drama as literature, however, may at times be inclined to regret that so much painstaking labour was expended on so ephemeral a subject as the figures, voices and attitudes, sighs and tears of all these departed Hamlets and Ophelias. In the heyday of German romanticism there must have been thousands of them, and with a critic of those times we may be allowed to wonder how many of them were really filled with the spirit of Shakespeare? As students of literature we seek the truth about *Hamlet*, that is we try to find out what Shakespeare meant with it. We are willing to accept the guidance of inspired players, fully admitting that their intuitive insight may shed light where the small candle of our learning leaves us in the dark. But is it not probable that an actor in creating Hamlet gives us the epitomized opinion of his time about this enigmatical character, rather than his own views revealed to him by his genius? At a time that Hamlet is supposed to be sentimental, weak, philosophical, inactive, what chance has an actor who gives a different portrait of him against the serried ranks of literary critics, and public opinion mainly formed by them?

To begin with what interested the author least, but us most, the versions played on the French and German stages. In 1745 La Place translated *Hamlet* into French. This translation was revised for the French stage by Ducis, who made a sort of classical French tragedy of it, in which there is little of Shakespeare's spirit left. In this version the Queen is an accomplice in the murder of her husband, Claudius is the father of Ophelia, Hamlet remains alive. This version was first performed on the Paris stage in 1769, and was frequently revised. The great Talma appeared in it. This French *Hamlet* is of interest to Dutchmen, because it was in the form of a modified Dutch translation of Ducis' *Hamlet* that our ancestors first became acquainted with Shakespeare's masterpiece in the closing years of the eighteenth century. The first Dutch *Hamlet* player was Hilverding.

The oldest German *Hamlet* is: *Der Bestrafte Brudermordt oder Prinz Hamlet aus Dännemark*, first printed in 1781 from a manuscript of 1710. It was probably a translation of some stage-version used by English comedians in the early years of the seventeenth century. It seems to contain pre-Shakespearean elements. It was possibly played in Germany as late as 1770 by the same company that also performed the *Faust Volksbuch*. Apart from this, three translations seem to have been used in Germany in the period under discussion, but each of them was constantly revised by stage-managers, according to their own tastes or the demands of their audiences, so that there

are innumerable versions. The three fundamental translations are

- a. C. M. Wieland's, in prose (1762—66).
- b. J. J. Eschenburg's (1775—77).
- c. A. W. Schlegel's, in blank verse (1798).

It is only the first and the third that need occupy us here. Wieland permitted himself many omissions, especially in places where the original was not to his taste, or where the translation presented difficulties, but he carefully acknowledged his alterations and omissions. He would have liked to omit the churchyard scene (this passage seems to have been particularly obnoxious to the Germany of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth) but he thought it was necessary that the reader should know something of this famous scene. Garrick had omitted it, but his successors inserted it again. This Wieland *Hamlet* was performed in the little town of Biberach by German schoolboys in the Christmas holidays of 1773.

In 1773 F. Heufeld re-arranged *Hamlet* for the Vienna stage after Wieland's translation. Except for considerable cuts Heufeld stuck almost literally to Wieland's prose-text. (The play-scene became poetry). Laertes, Fortinbras, Rosencrantz and the grave-diggers were left out. Ophelia's madness scenes were omitted. The Queen confesses to be guilty of the murder of her husband, Hamlet remains alive. Heufeld is responsible for the Danish names that became such a familiar feature of all German *Hamlet* performances of that time. Polonius became Oldenholm, Horatio Gustav, Marcellus Bernfield. For all this Heufeld's version gives a more faithful picture of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* than that of Ducis.

F. L. Schröder, a great actor and manager, and a warm admirer of Wieland's translations re-arranged Heufeld's text. First he limited himself to cuts, and a few re-insertions according to Wieland's text. He had to be very careful with his insertion of omitted passages, as the public did not at all take kindly to these novelties. The church-yard scene was only accepted under protest, he had to leave Hamlet alive. This means that as long as Schröder's often revised versions held the stage (in Berlin with a short break till 1816, Vienna 1820, Hamburg 1835) no audience saw the tragic end!

Schlegel's translation is a classic of German literature. The style is noble and poetical, there are hardly any omissions. When put upon the stage in Berlin in 1799 it was not appreciated. The audience, accustomed to Wieland-Schröder's much shorter text, thought it far too long. It had again to be replaced by Schröder's version, but after Schlegel had altered and struck out many passages, it was finally accepted on the Berlin stage in 1816. That the public could prefer Schröder's plain, wooden prose-text to Schlegel's noble language is matter of wonder if we compare the Queen's account of Ophelia's death in the two texts placed side by side.

After Goethe had published his opinions about *Hamlet* in *Wilhelm Meister*, F. L. Schmidt put *Hamlet* upon the stage at Magdeburg, using Schröder's version altered according to Goethe's ideas. This was the first time that two life-size portraits of the two kings were hung in the Queen's chamber. In 1815 Klingemann arranged Schlegel's translation in conformity with Goethe's recommendations in *Wilhelm Meister*. But he also took the liberty of inserting a few passages of his own invention, going to the length of having a choral sung at the funeral of Ophelia by youths and maidens. It must have been very pretty! The sacredness of Shakespeare's text, which makes us find fault with the new-fangled stage-directions in the New Cambridge



Shakespeare, seems to be a modern idea. A hundred years ago, though men like Schlegel protested, most people still thought they might alter an old author's text according to their own notions about the fitness of things. The same thing may be observed in the many "arrangements" of Bach's texts, against which musical critics have to protest to-day. One sometimes wonders what it was that made our ancestors such self-confident critics. They seem to have known such a lot of things, where we are only trying to learn.

There was quite a *Hamlet* rage in Germany from 1778 onward. No play drew such audiences. It was played in the smallest provincial towns. At Gotha, for instance, quite a small town, it was performed ten times in eighteen months. From 1780 we hear of *Hamlet* parodies, which also testify to the popularity of the play. There were even playing-cards with figures from *Hamlet* on them! People felt a certain parallelism between their own sentimental, inactive, thoughtful souls and Hamlet's (supposed) sentimentality, scepticism and "Grübeleien". The question may here be left undiscussed whether there was any ground for this supposed likeness, or whether the Germans of those times did not rather project their own mentality on that of the Danish prince. It is worth observing that there has always been some correspondence between the ideas of Germans about the character of Hamlet and the political situation of their country.<sup>1</sup> He was always a Teuton of the Teutons of course, a native of that pleasant city of Copenhagen and a student at Lutheran Wittenberg! We expect he will soon turn Aryan now. Did not he fool those two false Jews Rosencrantz and Guildenstern?

The greater part of the book is taken up by very circumstantial accounts of the actors and actresses who appeared in *Hamlet* between 1770 and 1870, their journeys, their successes and failures. Among the most famous German names are Brockmann, who tried to imitate Garrick, Schröder whose tragic acting made his hearers shudder and look pale, Wolff who was taught by Goethe and was praised for the subtlety of his acting, "durchgeistigt, seelenvoll." From what his colleagues write about him, there is no Hamlet player that I should rather have seen than this pupil of Goethe's, who in his turn influenced Emil Devrient, the "ideal" Hamlet player of the middle years of the nineteenth century. The latter's greatest triumph was his series of performances in England, where he was highly popular, both with the public and with his English colleagues. Moritz Rott played Hamlet as a full-blooded, choleric man, not by any means sicklied o'er by the pale cast of thought. Would not Mr. Stoll and certain other American scholars have loved to see him!

Paradoxical as it may seem, in this book, which is all about actors, intensely living men and women, many of them supreme artists, there is little of that personal element, the human touch we might say, which might have made it so enjoyable. This is the fault of the compiler. The material was there. Those who can read between the lines find the matter for a bitter-sweet story in the life of Frau Felicitas Abt, who came from a patrician family in the little Suabian town of Biberach, where young Wieland was clerk of the town in the years between 1760 and 1770. His official duties evidently leaving him some spare time, he translated Shakespeare's plays and performed them with amateurs on the stage. She was quite a young girl when she became one of Wieland's best pupils. She chose the stage as a profession, rose to great

<sup>1</sup> Cf. H. Rochocz, *Hamlet für die deutsche Jugend. Die Neueren Sprachen*, Mai-Juni 1933, pp. 211—220. — Ed.

eminence in her calling, made extensive journeys, resolved to follow the example of Sarah Siddons and became the first female Hamlet player in Germany, overworked herself, was ill-treated by her rough husband, got consumption and died an early death. The reader will agree with us that something might have been made of this. But we must not grumble. The bare facts, after all, are here, and our sympathetic imagination must fill in the story.

There is also a good account of the principal English actors who appeared in *Hamlet*, from Burbage, for whom the play may have been written, through Betterton who continued the tradition into the eighteenth century, on to Garrick, whose fame, through the translations of *Tom Jones*, and through letters to continental periodicals spread all over Europe. After Garrick's death the part fell to John Philip Kemble, who seems to have played the tragedy "as Shakespeare wrote the play," without omissions and alterations. Due mention is made of Edmund Kean who was praised by Byron and Heine. It is said that certain gestures of Kean's have shed light on many a dark passage in Shakespeare but also that the best description cannot do justice to Kean's acting, which is an ironic sort of saying in a book like this. Some attention is paid to the reformations of William Macready on the English stage, and to the exaggerated magnificence of Charles Kean's performances, which unfortunate tradition was carried to extremes by Henry Irving. With this greatest of all English actors the survey closes.

The book has a very good index of eighteen pages, and fifty-five good illustrations.

Amsterdam.

H. DE GROOT.

*Der Nachruhm Herricks und Wallers.* Von NETTY ROECKERATH.  
Leipzig, Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1932. (Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten,  
Heft XIII.) Pp. 115. RM. 7.—.

In eighteenth-century criticism the name of no English poet was more familiar than that of Waller. From the time of Dryden to well nigh the time of Wordsworth he was regarded as the first refiner of the English language, the first to achieve technical perfection in verse, and his works were held up by poets, critics and theorists alike as the criterion by which all poetry should be judged. But Herrick? We can search biographical dictionaries, such as Giles Jacob's *Poetical Register*, we can look through miscellanies of English poetry, and we shall hardly find so much as a passing reference to him. He was forgotten. So much so that when, in 1796, a person of literary and antiquarian tastes came across a copy of the *Hesperides* he wrote to *The Gentleman's Magazine* to enquire whether anything was known of this Robert Herrick.

The purpose of Dr. Roeckerath's book is to trace out the rise and fall respectively in the reputation of the two poets since their death. Setting out with the assumption that both are of more or less equal merit, she shows, by abundance of quotation, that when Waller's glory stood high, Herrick was neglected; as soon as Herrick came to be appreciated, Waller was deposed

from his pedestal, so that today, to the average reader of poetry, he is little more than a name, while the songs of his contemporary find their place in all anthologies. The Waller cult died hard, and as for Herrick, he had to wait long for his due of appreciation, for if he was neglected by the Augustans and their successors, even the romantics of the nineteenth century were slow to give him a place. But he won it at last, and the turn of the tide was marked by that enquiry of 1796. The replies which it elicited awakened a new interest, so that, in spite of Southey's adverse views, Drake could declare in 1804 that "If in point of versification Herrick may enter into competition with either Carew or Waller, he will be found still more competent to contend with them as to sentiment and imagery ... I hesitate not, therefore, to consider him in the same degree superior to Carew as Carew is to Waller"; and then he could add a remark which even at that date must have shocked all orthodox opinion: "If every line of Waller were lost, I know not that poetry would have much to lament."

How are we to explain the early popularity of Waller? Dr. Roeckerath believes that the reason is mainly political. And the neglect of Herrick? Perhaps the indecency of some of his verses is to be blamed; Southey called the *Hesperides* "a dunghill", and other critics of the day stigmatised it in similar terms; but an age that could read Prior's epigrams and D'Urfey's *Pills to Purge Melancholy* without a blush was not likely to have been seriously shocked by Herrick. Drake's suggestion of the inequality of his work may, again, have some truth in it, but one feels that even that does not give a satisfactory explanation. After all, literary fame is a hazardous thing, and it is not always easy for us to see a poet's works from the view-point of his contemporaries, or even of another age. Our author has judged the two poets by her own standard and those of the twentieth century. Their own age and the succeeding judged them by others, and that makes all the difference. Apart from this the book is a competent and illuminating piece of work.

Sheffield.

FREDERICK T. WOOD.

*Die Charakterschilderungen im "Tatler", "Spectator", und "Guardian": Ihr Verhältnis zu Theophrast, La Bruyère, und den englischen Character-Writers des 17. Jahrhunderts.* Von Dr. WILHELM PAPENHEIM. Leipzig, Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1930. (Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie, Heft XV.) RM. 6.30.

The thesis which this book is an attempt to establish and elaborate is summed up in a single sentence in the final section: "die Charaktere des Tatler, Spectator und Guardian gehören in eine Entwicklungslinie der Charakterschilderung, von der Theophrast den Anfang und Addison und Steele den Endpunkt bedeuten". In other words, the character-sketches of *The Tatler*, *The Spectator*, and *The Guardian* were no new genre in English literature; they were connected essentially with the "characters" of the preceding century, with the character-studies of La Bruyère, and through these went ultimately back to Theophrastus, the father of this type of literature.



As early as 1688 La Bruyère had translated Theophrastus into French; the translation, as well as La Bruyère's own writings, was well known in England throughout the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries, and it was directly from these sources that Addison and Steele drew a great part of their material — almost 80 %, in fact — for the characters in their periodical essays. This, briefly, is a summary of the main trend of Dr. Papenheim's book, and let us say at the outset that the author has gone far to prove his contention. He prints some sixty pages of parallel passages from La Bruyère and from Addison and Steele, which show beyond doubt that the authors of *The Tatler*, *Spectator* and *Guardian* were well acquainted with the work of the French essayist, that it undoubtedly exerted a considerable influence over their own writings, and that in many cases passages were lifted direct from La Bruyère, freely translated and expanded, and incorporated into the body of an essay in English. In tracing out these parallels so carefully, Dr. Papenheim has done a most valuable piece of work, and all eighteenth-century scholars will wish to thank him for opening up to them a new field for further researches. For the significance of his discovery goes beyond the work of Addison and Steele; it suggests a new problem: namely, the extent of La Bruyère's influence upon English literature as a whole during the Augustan age. It is a subject which has never been fully worked out. Perhaps now that Dr. Papenheim has given a lead, other scholars will follow.

But to suggest that our author has made a mere compilation of parallel passages in English and French is to do his book an injustice. He has gone much further than that. In the opening chapters he gives a comprehensive view of every form of literature (essays, letters, allegory, romances, etc.) which might have exerted an influence on, or themselves have been influenced by, the development of the character-sketch, and then goes on to distinguish between the various methods of character-portrayal, such as the objective, the subjective, the direct and the indirect, all of which are to be found in the literature of the early eighteenth century. The great difference between the characters of the seventeenth century, he points out, and those of the eighteenth, lies in a single fact: that whereas the tone of the earlier writers such as Overbury, Hall and Earle was predominantly cynical, that of the authors of the Augustan age tended towards the moral. And what is the reason for this change? Dr. Papenheim finds it in the growing social-consciousness of the eighteenth century. Well, no doubt this is part of the explanation, for the movement which today we have come to style sentimentalism had many ramifications; but it is only part. To be quite candid, Dr. Papenheim seems to have mistaken the symptom for the cause, and to have rested content with a mere superficial explanation, for sentimentalism was but the outcome of the new philosophy, which was to find its ultimate expression in Rousseau. Where the seventeenth century stressed the obligations of man, the eighteenth laid emphasis upon the rights of man, and therein lay the difference.

Then, again, Dr. Papenheim sees in these essayists of the eighteenth century the beginnings of Romanticism. "Wir haben (Addison und Steele) als Vertreter des Rationalismus kennengelernt. Doch leben sie bereits in einem neuen England, das mit seiner Annäherung an bürgerliche Geselligkeit, mit der Vorliebe für Märchen und orientalische Erzählungen und mit der Rückkehr zu geordnetem Familienleben den Beginn einer neuen Kulturströmung anzeigt, die Romantik. Addison und Steele sind ihre frühen Vorläufer."

(p. 35) Of course, in a sense the author is right. If we accept the evolutionary view of literature, every writer and every epoch is a forerunner of some other, even if a very remote one; but most students will find it difficult to see any real resemblance between Addison and Steele and the Romantics. They are much nearer in spirit to Pope on the one hand and to the sentimental drama on the other. One suspects that now and again Dr. Papenheim is carried away by enthusiasm for his subject; and that may explain why, in one or two cases, he has tried to trace influences where the characters in question are so obviously types that they might have been drawn, quite independently, by any writer or in any age. Yet despite these faults, as has been said already, Dr. Papenheim's book is an important one, and fills a gap in the literature dealing with the eighteenth century. The insistence upon the influence of La Bruyère is, of course, its main interest, but the author shows also how Addison and Steele improved upon their models by the introduction of a subjective element, a sense of humour, and a wonderful narrative power which links them with the precursors of the early novel. The work, in general, is characterised by thoroughness and balance of treatment, while the methodical arrangement renders it an easy book of reference.

Sheffield.

FREDERICK T. WOOD.

*An Investigation into the Character of Fanny Burney.* By DR A. A. OVERMAN. Amsterdam, H. J. Paris. 1933. 221 pp. f 3.40.

"The fundamental note of Fanny Burney's life", declares Dr. Overman in her conclusion to this dissertation (p. 205) "can be expressed by passivity, "heart", and reverence. The poles of her moods were melancholy and gaiety or serenity". And to this she adds, a few pages later, "love was of far greater importance to her than learning or genius, and she knew that she was not loved the less for being brilliant." In these two pronouncements are contained all the fundamentals of that genius and personality which revealed itself in the famous diary, and which went to the making of *Evelina*. Basing her study upon her author's own works, upon her confessions in her diary and correspondence, upon the opinions of her contemporaries, and upon psychological research, Dr. Overman has subjected the character of Fanny Burney to a minute analysis. That was her primary aim; but actually she has gone farther than this, for she has traced out something of Miss Burney's relation to the world of letters of her day, and has given us some apt and telling animadversions upon the more important of her writings.

Fanny Burney, one feels, would have liked such a book as this. It is of just the type that she herself would have written had she been faced with the same task as Dr. Overman, for in no way is it an ambitious work. There is an unfortunate tendency among a certain class of biographers to idolise their subject: to exaggerate virtues and to overlook shortcomings. This tendency Dr. Overman has happily avoided, and as a result the picture which she gives is all the more human. For to regard Fanny Burney as a great writer, or even as a great personality, would be manifestly wrong. Even when she was Madame D'Arblay, the goddess of one section of the polite world of her

day, she always eschewed any claim to greatness, while for the whole of her life she was somewhat retiring. This characteristic, in fact, Dr. Overman finds is a basic one, inherited from her father, who achieved a musical fame in spite of it. "The diffidence which Dr. Burney had known", writes our author, "was a trouble against which all the Burney children had to fight. It seems to have run in the whole family..... but in none of them was it so strong as in Fanny". And if this be so, many of the enigmas of her character are explained. Then, too, she was possessed of more than her share of what the eighteenth century pleased to call "sensibility", and these two traits together probably account for her modesty and "infantilism", as Dr. Overman styles it. Now here our author is treading on controversial ground, for earlier writers are by no means agreed that she was always modest. They point out in support of their assertion the facts that she was unduly sensitive to the judgements of others, and that she was prone to moralising, as though a great weight of authority attached itself to her opinions. Well, perhaps something is to be said for this view; but it certainly seems to us that the present author has succeeded in proving her point: namely that to the end of her life Miss Burney retained a certain childishness, a vulnerability and a desire for sympathy. These, at least, are the distinguishing traits of the heroine of *Evelina*, and as Dr. Overman has shown in the earlier stages of her work, that heroine is above all a piece of self-revelation on the part of the author.

Dr. Overman, no doubt, is right when she says (p. 168) that Fanny Burney's present reputation is due largely to Macaulay; yet on her own showing Macaulay failed signally to understand his heroine in several important respects. That misunderstanding has been perpetuated ever since. There is the question, for instance, of her affectation. Dr. Overman frankly denies that she was ever affected, but concedes that "her fastidious notions about female delicacy, as expressed in her novels, might easily be mistaken for affectation." Quite true, they might; but does that get to the bottom of the question? Surely it is a matter of changing social environment. It was during the life-time of Madame D'Arblay, be it remembered, that Mrs. Grundy made her appearance in the wings of the London theatre; the Victorian "respectability" was already making its presence felt, and in the works of Fanny Burney we see some of the first symptoms. That, it seems, is the real explanation. Miss Burney was suffering, not from affectation, but from a too great love of propriety.

It is curious that this Victorian element seems never to have struck our author. To a reader familiar with both the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, it is indicated by many of the traits which Dr. Overman adduces. Her essentially feminine cast of mind, for instance, which, as pointed out on page 38, prompted her to shun politics and social questions as "too masculine a subject for a woman", was at bottom a reaction from the bluestocking attitude towards that of the Tennysonian heroine. The extreme sensibility of her women, if it is not copied from Richardson (as Dr. Overman avows it is not) is but another indication of the same reaction, while that superficiality of treatment which our author notes (or, as she prefers to call it, an accumulation of impressions without depth) is again a characteristic which was to become more marked in the typical Victorian woman writer. In fact, I am not sure that we should be far wrong if we designated Fanny Burney, who died three years after Queen Victoria ascended the throne, the first of the Victorians.



Whether or not Dr. Overman finds her readers in entire agreement with her, the fact remains that she has given us the first exhaustive character-study of Fanny Burney. If anything, her work suffers from over-elaboration. The character with which she deals, as she herself admits, was not a complex one, and it might have been treated a little more concisely. Now and again the author shows a tendency to repeat herself, and occasionally we find it difficult to make certain statements square with each other. On page 176 she asserts that Madame D'Arblay's was a concrete intelligence which dealt with persons rather than facts, and paid little attention to universal phenomena. Yet only a few pages after this we read of her strong critical tendency: and a critical tendency, surely, is concerned first and foremost with facts, is abstract rather than concrete in character, and inclines to the universal rather than the particular. Finally, an index would have been appreciated. It is a pity that we should not be able to find our way more easily about so interesting and useful a book.

Sheffield.

FREDERICK T. WOOD.

---

1. *Der Arbeiterroman in England seit 1880.* Von A. ROTTER, Prag. (Schriften der Deutschen Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Reichenberg. Heft 7.) Reichenberg, 1929.

2. *Frank Swinnerton und George Gissing.* Eine kritische Studie von A. ROTTER, Prag. (Schriften der Philosophischen Fakultät der Deutschen Universität. 8. Band.) Prag, 1930.

3. *George Gissing und die Soziale Frage.* Von DR. ANTON WEBER. (Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie. Herausgegeben von Max Förster. Heft XX.) Leipzig, 1932.

1. In "Der Arbeiterroman" Mr. Rotter deals with the novels of Walter Besant and Gissing (*Die Achtziger Jahre*), with Morrison, Somerset Maugham, St. John Alcock, Edwin Pugh, Pett Ridge (*Die Neunziger Jahre*) and with Richard Whiteing, Harold Brighouse, Bart Kennedy, Robert Tressall, James Welsh and H. A. Vachell (*Das neue Jahrhundert*). As only few of these authors wrote genuine working-class novels the title of Mr. Rotter's study is somewhat misleading. We do not get what we expect: a treatment of the social aspects and values in these novels. Mr. Rotter's method is chiefly that of a source-burrower. Wherever he discovers a possible or impossible resemblance between two authors he pounces upon it and treasures it. By so doing he has succeeded in turning the art of such authors as Gissing, Morrison and Whiteing into lifeless, dull stuff. Such authoritative utterances as: "Richard Mutimer<sup>1</sup> ist Alton Locke" (p. 26) would be extremely annoying but for their being so irresistibly funny. Neither Kingsley nor Besant — as Mr. Rotter is at some pains to point out — had any influence worth mentioning on Gissing's work. (Cf. Dr. Anton Weber). A propos of Dickens' influence on Gissing Mr. Rotter observes: "Der Umstand, dass sich beide an der Darstellung verwandten Milieus versucht haben, ist nicht hinreichend eine

---

<sup>1</sup> the hero of Gissing's *Demos*.

solche Behauptung aufzustellen." (p. 119) The learned critic would have done well to apply this sensible conclusion rigorously. If, by doing so, his study had been left unwritten, the loss to us would not have been irreparable.

2. This same source-burrowing method is reduced ad absurdum in Mr. Rotter's study of Frank Swinnerton. Of poor Swinnerton — in my opinion a second-rate author, who wrote one clever realistic romance: *Nocturne* — nothing remains but a tottering skeleton after Mr. Rotter's scientific autopsy. One specimen of Mr. Rotter's criticism may serve to condemn it. With respect to *Nocturne* he says: "Mit unvergleichlicher psychologischer Einsicht und künstlerischen Zartgefühl hat Swinnerton in dieser realistischen Studie dargestellt, wie die keineswegs leichtsinnige Mädchennatur nach schwerem inneren Kampf der Gewalt des Männlichen unterliegt." A fine feather in Swinnerton's cap! But cap and feather are hopelessly spoilt by the tail of the same paragraph: „Und diese Perle unter den Swinnertonschen Schöpfungen ist wieder Zug um Zug dem Gissingschen Roman *Thyrza* nachgedichtet." (p. 48).

*Nocturne*, as the word *wieder* in the above quotation spitefully explains, is not the only one of Swinnerton's novels that exists but by the grace of *Thyrza*: at least three other novels have drawn their lifeblood from that source. On p. 14, Mr. Rotter prints a schematic representation of Gissing's influence on Swinnerton. There are a couple of titles marked with a + which belong to a different literary tradition. It does one good to learn that in these books Browning and Galsworthy have had their dominant shares (p. 93—94).

The wrongheadedness of this kind of criticism is clearly proved by such statements as: "Ich fand nicht einen Gissing, *den ich suchte*<sup>1</sup>, sondern einen Dickens vor," (p. 79), and: "Eine fremde Kraft, die wir bisher noch niemals gefühlt, *musz*<sup>1</sup> dem Autor die Hand geführt haben." Poor Swinnerton, who at an age when less gifted persons pride themselves upon their independence, could not yet walk alone!

3. If Mr. Rotter's studies showed us German learning at its worst, the excellent dissertation of Dr. Weber shows that same learning at its very best. It combines thoroughness with humanity and is thus easily the best book we possess on Gissing's attitude towards society and social problems. The introduction: *Motivierung der allgemeinen sozialen Einstellung Gissings*, proves that Weber fully understands Gissing's character, whose weaknesses he uncovers with a capable though gentle hand and whose intricacies he pursues with a sure instinct. In composing his character-study Dr. Weber has made frequent use of the *Letters*, which is surely the best source for an intimate knowledge of Gissing's personality: a far trustworthier one, indeed, than Morley Roberts' *Private Life of Henry Maitland*, into which Dr. Weber has dipped once too often, I am afraid. That Gissing came back "gestärkt" from his visit to Greece (p. 25) is in direct contradiction with the diary, in which we read: "England is a failure with me; twelve years of hopeless struggle have convinced me that I must look for a home on the continent". Not before October of the same year did Gissing recover the strength needed to begin *New Grub Street*<sup>2</sup>.

Incidentally Dr. Weber treats Rotter's criticism of Gissing (pp. 54—63).

<sup>1</sup> my italics. v. M.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. my article on Gissing's Letters in *Neophilologus*, Jan. 1933, p. 125.

His criticism of R's method is polite but crushing, though his conclusion is guardedly worded: "Die an Rotters Untersuchungen geübte Kritik will keinen Vorwurf wissenschaftlicher Ungenauigkeit gegen diesen erheben, sondern lediglich auf die Möglichkeit verschiedener Auslegung gewisser Stellen hinweisen und vor etwaiger kritikloser Uebernahme der von Rotter erzielten Ergebnisse warnen." Dr. Weber need not be afraid: we are not entirely without criticism for R's results. In a footnote Dr. Weber warns also against Rotter's conclusions in his study of Frank Swinnerton. He feels himself entitled to do so on the ground of a private correspondence with Swinnerton.<sup>1</sup>

In the second section, *Gissing's Sozialer Determinismus*, Dr. W. treats a number of the social novels in which G's determinism comes most to the fore. From *Workers in the Dawn* to *Born in Exile* he follows the continuity of G's occupation with the problems of poverty, heredity, education, etc. He stresses G's wavering attitude towards the great problems of life: "seine Haltung ist oft unklar, verschwommen, unsicher und schwankend." (p. 140.) It is probably due to this attitude that G. so frequently and penetratingly pictured the fin-de-siècle type of the decadent who succumbs to his self-analysis.

The third section treats of Gissing's opinion on the possibilities of social reform and of emancipation of the proletariat. He points out that Gissing never had a definite social program, though he treated several subjects with great capability, especially the relations of labour, apprenticeship, shop-assistantship, unemployment, workhouses, dispensary doctors, housing, etc. Also Gissing's attitude towards the church, for the "pious jugglery" of which he felt little love, is thoroughly investigated into by Dr. W. He thinks Gissing's criticism exaggerated, in which he is probably right. Gissing never had much inside knowledge of the church and churchmen, being an agnostic all his life. He railed at a type, and at a Victorian type, rather than at a class.

To Gissing, as to many a social reformer, the only means of lifting up the lower classes would seem education. Yet he also clearly saw the dangers of teaching the unbred. The reversal of Gissing's social optimism already took place at an early period in his career. Only *Workers in the Dawn* is inspired with a genuine, unwavering love of the downtrodden. Gradually this love lessened and what remained was a kind of aristo-socialism. He would even not be averse to a kind of "benevolent despot", following Carlyle in this respect.

In section four, *Gissing's gesellschaftliche Kritik der Mittelklasse*, Dr. Weber draws our attention to Gissing's hatred of commonplace people, of mediocrity and vulgarity of taste. He points out that essentially G. was a strong conservative, on which I venture to disagree with him. Gissing always wanted the world different; up to his death he continued to believe in the improvement of social conditions and the alleviation of the horrors of poverty. His conservatism, if we may call it so, was rather the outcome of his artistic manner than of his mental attitude.

Clever observations are made by Dr. W. in section five on *Die Frauenfrage*, on the pose of so many educated women, on free wedlock as opposed to the bondage of legal marriage. Here again Gissing wavered between the traditional and the modern notions and in the end had to acknowledge the necessity of a social marriage-law. He was, as Dr. W. observes, like his

<sup>1</sup> See also a review of Rotter's book by Weber, and a letter from Swinnerton, in *Englische Studien*, LXVIII, 1 (1933.) — E d.



own Mallard "a curious instance of the Puritan conscience surviving in a man whose intellect is liberated." That Gissing was an anti-imperialist and a hater of war is stressed by Dr. W. in the last section of his dissertation. He refers in this connection to the „Heldentod" of Gissing's younger son, a word which would seem to me to be badly chosen. Fortunately Gissing did not live to be a witness of the Great War, whose coming he had, however, more than once prophesied.

In his *Schlussbemerkung* Dr. W. points out that Gissing is foremost a psychologist and only in the second instance a socialist. His pessimistic scepticism made it impossible for him to continually believe in and suggest methods for the improvement of society. He might have crowned his life's work with a "Symphonie der Freude" if he had lived to a more advanced age. "Im letzten Grunde ist Gissings Realismus ja nur halb ein Instinkt seiner Natur, kein rein künstlerischer Impuls wie bei seinen Lehrmeistern Balzac und Zola, sondern vielleicht doch mehr durch die eiserne Disziplin seines Willens und durch Reflexion handwerksmäßig erzeugt." (p. 295). In contrast with many other authors of the new realism Gissing went his way from realism to romanticism. That this landed him on the same shore as Galsworthy, as Dr. W. asserts, I cannot subscribe to. Nor do I think that Gissing left a school behind him: he may have influenced such authors as Morrison, Pugh, Pett Ridge and Swinnerton, but his manner, style and treatment were purely individual and thus inimitable.

Rotterdam.

W. VAN MAANEN.

## Bibliography.

### PERIODICALS.

**Neophilologus.** XVIII, 2. Jan. 1933. W. van Maanen, George Gissing's life from his letters (115-130). — A. E. H. Swaen, A letter from Sir Walter Scott to James Ballantyne. (130-131). — *Id.* XVIII, 3. April 1933. J. H. Harder, The authorship of *A Modest Defence of Public Stews* etc. (200-204). — *Id.* XVIII, 4. July 1933. W. W. Greg, The function of bibliography in literary criticism illustrated in a study of the text of *King Lear* (241-262). — F. T. Wood, Sentimental comedy in the eighteenth century, II (281-289).

**Levende Talen.** No. 74. Maart 1933. E. Kruisinga, De werkwoordsvorm op *-ing*. — *Id.* No. 76. Sept. 1933. E. Kruisinga, Taalwetenschap en taalgeschiedenis.

**Anglia.** LVI, 1. 1932. W. Leopold, Der Mitteilungsvorgang und die innere Sprachform. — L. Morsbach, Sprache, Satz, Syntax, Stil. — W. Krogmann, Ae. *orcneas*. — H. B. Hinckley, The date of *Lazamon's Brut*. — F. Holthausen, Zu mittelenglischen Dichtungen. — M. Klein, Form und Aufbau der Tragödien *Macbeth*, *Othello*, *Lear*, *Hamlet* — ein Ausdruck des Wesens ihrer Handlungsträger. — A. H. Krappe, A Welsh animal tale in England. — I. Marinoff, Hugh Walpole. — E. E. Ericson, Some observations on New English syntax. — *Id.* LVI, 2/3. 1932. H. M. Flasdieck, Studien zur schriftsprachlichen Entwicklung der neuenglischen Velarvokale in Verbindung mit R. — K. Jost, Einige Wulfstan-texte und ihre Quellen. — E. Schröder, *Beowulf*. — G. P. Smith, A note to lines 18-20, act II, sc. 1 of *As You Like It*. — *Id.* LVI, 4, 1932. H. M. Flasdieck, Studien zur schriftsprachlichen Entwicklung der neuenglischen Velarvokale in Verbindung mit R. — Fr. Kläeber, Eine kleine Nachlese zum *Beowulf*. — A. H. Krappe, A 'Viking legend' in England. — K. Malone, Notes on *Beowulf* VI. — W. Krogmann, Ae. *isig*. — I. Marinoff,

Das Lebensgefühl im modernen englischen Roman. — K. Jost, Nachtrag (zu S. 265ff.) — *Id.* LVII, 1. 1933. W. Schmidt, Die Entwicklung der englisch-schottischen Volksballaden, I. — J. Ellinger, Substantivsätze mit oder ohne *that* in der neueren englischen Literatur. — J. Hoops, Nochmals *ae. orc*. — W. Krogmann, *Ae. orc*. — *Id.* LVII, 2. 1933. W. Schmidt, Die Entwicklung der englisch-schottischen Volksballaden, II. — H. M. Flasdieck, *Ae. ðow*. — W. Krogmann, *Ae. gang*. — K. Malone, Notes on *Beowulf* VII. — W. Fischer, Ein wenig bekanntes Autogramm Miltons. — *Id.* LVII, 3. 1933. F. Karpf, Die erlebte Rede im Englischen. — W. Schmidt, Die Entwicklungsgeschichte der Edward-Ballade. — K. Malone, Notes on *Beowulf* VIII. — A. Furuhielm, *Beowulfiana*. — *Id.* LVII, 4. F. Roeder, Neue Funde auf kontinental-sächsischen Friedhöfen der Völkerwanderungszeit. Mit 30 Tafeln. — F. P. Magoun, *Cynewulf, Cyneheard, and Osric*. — W. Krogmann, *Ae. dyde*. — W. Krogmann, *orc* und *orcnæas*. — P. J. Irwin, *The lost Loscombe manuscript: a transcript*. — E. Schröder, Nochmals *Beowulf* = 'Bienenwolf'.

**Beiblatt zur Anglia.** XLIII, 3. Febr. 1932. E. Eckhardt reviews Bosker, *Literary Criticism in the Age of Johnson*. — *Id.* XLIII, 5. Mai 1932. F. Holthausen, Zur *ae.* metrischen Psalmenübersetzung. II. — *Id.*, Zu *Beowulf* V. 3074f. — *Id.* XLIII, 6. Juni 1932. K. R. Gallas reviews Pienaar, *English Influences in Dutch Literature and Justus van Effen as Intermediary*. — L. L. Schücking, Das Wort „disposer“ bei Shakespeare. — H. M. Flasdieck, *Ne. to prune*. — *Id.* XLIII, 7. Juli 1932. J. Ellinger, Das Pronomen *it* als formales Objekt. — E. E. Ericson, *A matter of word-coinage*. — *Id.* XLIII, 8. Aug. 1932. F. Holthausen, Zu *Finnsburg* V. 36. — A. H. Krappe, The origin of "Rule Britannia" once more. — *Id.* XLIII, 9. Sept. 1932. F. Holthausen, Volksetymologien. — K. Malone, On the OE. sound-shift  $\bar{e} > \bar{i}$ . — J. Ellinger, Indirekte Fragesätze im Anschluss an Präpositionen. I. — *Id.* XLIII, 10. Okt. 1932. J. Ellinger, Indirekte Fragesätze im Anschluss an Präpositionen. II. — *Id.* XLIII, 12. Dez. 1932. K. R. Gallas reviews Reesink, *L'Angleterre et la Littérature anglaise dans les (trois) plus anciens périodiques de Hollande de 1684 à 1709*. — *Id.* XLIV, 1. P. Meissner reviews C. van Doorn, *An Investigation into the Character of Jonathan Swift*. — F. Holthausen, Zu *ae. 7* für  $\bar{e}$ . — *Id.* XLIV, 3. März 1933. F. Holthausen, Die Quelle der altenglischen Andreas-Legenden. — *Id.* XLIV, 4. April 1933. M. Förster, Zum Exeter-Kodex. — *Id.* XLIV, 5. Mai 1933. A. Eichler reviews Kruisinga, *An Introduction to the Study of English Sounds*. — A. Möller, Zu Miltons rabbinischen Studien. — *Id.* XLIV, 6. Juni 1933. K. Malone, The OE sound-shift  $\bar{e} > \bar{i}$  once more. — F. Holthausen, Zum Obigen. — K. Malone, Last word. — *Id.* XLIV, 7. Juli 1933. F. Holthausen reviews Bense, *A Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary*, III. — H. Lüdeke, John George Robertson †. — *Id.* XLIV, 8. Aug. 1933. W. Fischer reviews Mary of Nimmegen, *Introduction by Ayres and Barnow*. — F. Holthausen, Der Name des Buchstaben *y*.

**Englische Studien.** LXVI, 2. 1932. G. Langenfelt, Notes on the Anglo-Saxon Pioneers. — M. Day, Strophic division in Middle English alliterative verse. — H. Jantzen, Zeugnisse für das Eindringen der englischen Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts in Deutschland. — P. Fijn van Draat, Irrational constructions. — *Id.* LXVI, 3. 1932. R. Imelmann, *Beowulf* 489f, 600, 769. — W. Krogmann, *Ae. \*scerwan*. — E. von Erhardt-Siebold, Some inventions of the pre-romantic period and their influence upon literature. — B. J. Morse, Dante Gabriel Rossetti and William Blake. — M. Ellehaug, The initial stages in the development of the English problem-play. — *Id.* LXVII, 1. 1932. L. L. Schücking, Das Königsideal in *Beowulf*. — W. Krogmann, *Ealuscerven* und *meoduscerven*. — F. Kläeber, *Beowulf* 769. — P. Meissner, Die Stellung des Menschen im englischen Geistesleben des 17. Jahrhunderts. — J. W. Draper, Poetry and music in eighteenth century aesthetics. — P. Fijn van Draat, Cannon-ball. — K. Arns, Lytton Strachey. — P. Meissner reviews Zandvoort, *Sidney's Arcadia*, a comparison between the two versions. — F. T. Wood reviews Teerink, *The History of John Bull*; de Haas, *Nature and the Countryside in English Poetry of the First Half of the Eighteenth Century*; and Bosker, *Literary Criticism in the Age of Johnson*. — S. B. Liljegren reviews Schults, *Het Byronianisme in Nederland*. — *Id.* LXVII, 2. 1932. W. Krogmann, *Bēowulf*. — H. Koziol, Zur Frage der Verfälschung einiger mittellenglischer Stabreimdichtungen. — A. H. Krappe, An oriental theme in *Sir Ysumbras*. — C. E. Burch, British criticism of Defoe as a Novelist 1719-1860. — B. J. Morse, Crabb Robinson and Goethe in England. — E. Goldschmidt, Der Gedankengehalt von Baileys *Festus*. — H. Hecht, Der Sünden-esser. — *Id.* LXVII, 3. 1933. K. Malone, "Ic wæs mid Eolum." — R. Imelmann, *Beowulf* 303ff. und 3074f. — F. Kläeber, Three textual notes. — A. S. C. Ross,

Notes on some Old English words. — H. Heuer, Zum Formproblem in Brownings *Sordello*. — R. Hoops, Die schottische Renaissancebewegung. — *Id.* LXVIII, 1. 1933. R. Imetmann, Beowulf 3074f.: Nachprüfung. — J. Caro, Zur mittellenglischen Genesis und Exodus. — M. Rößler, Die Lebensweise der Ausländer in England im späteren Mittelalter and in der Renaissance. — L. Kellner †, Shakespeares Sonette. — H. Koziol, Das emphatische Praesens-pro-futuro im Englischen. — E. Goldschmidt, Der Gedankeninhalt von Robert Browning's *Paracelsus*. — W. van der Gaaf reviews Poutsma, A Grammar of Late Modern English, Part II, Section II: The Verb and the Particles. — *Id.* LXVIII, 2. 1933. G. Stern, Old English *frstlic* and *fus*. — H. Lange, Ein neuer Chaucerfund. — K. Brunner, Der Streit der vier Himmelstöchter. — F. Eckhardt, Deutsche Bearbeitungen älterer englischer Dramen. — M. Schütt, Die Quellen des "Book of Sir Thomas More". — B. J. Morse, Dante Gabriel Rossetti and Dante Alighieri. — F. T. Wood reviews Zwager, *The English Philosophic Lyric*; and Van Doorn, *Of the Tribe of Homer*.

**Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen.** CLX, 3/4. 1931. J. A. Falconer, Two manuscripts at Abbotsford. — O. Lohmann, Byrons Manfred und Schumanns Musik. — *Id.* CLXI, 1/2. 1932. H. Harder, Eine angelsächsische Ring-Inschrift. — K. Brunner, Lydgatiana. — H. Marcus, Unterdrückte Revolutionsverse des jungen R. Southey: 'Muir und Palmer.' — *Id.* CLII, 3/4. 1932. H. Marcus, Unterdrückte Revolutionsverse des jungen R. Southey: 'Muir und Palmer.' — K. Brunner, Spätme. Lehrgedichte. — *Id.* CLII, 1/2. 1932. M. Förster, Abt Raoul d'Escures und der spätere. 'Sermo in Festis S. Marie.' — H. Hecht, Lord Byron versus Francis Merryweather. — H. Bock, Die religiösen Dramen George Moores. — G. Langenfelt, Anti-Englisches in der irländischen Literatur. — *Id.* CLXII, 3/4. 1933. J. Bolte, Die Heidelberger Verdeutschung von Buchanans Tragödie Baptistes. — R. Colenutt, The English 'obscure' vowels. — A. Brandl, Zur Entstehung der germ. Heldensage, gesehen vom ags. Standpunkt. — *Id.* CLXIII, 1/2. 1933. J. Bolte, Die Heidelberger Verdeutschung von Buchanans Tragödie Baptistes (Schuss). — F. Mezger, Ae. *craftiga* 'artifex' — ae. *byrdiga* 'plumaria.' — J. Koch, Goethe und Byron. — P. Meissner reviews Zwager, *The English philosophic lyric*. — A. B(randt) notices Mary of Nimmegen, intr. by Ayres & Barnouw. — *Id.* CLXIII, 3/4. G. Schleich, Zur Sprache Lord Berners'.

**Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift.** XX, 1/2. 1932. F. Holthausen, Wortklärungen. — *Id.* XX, 3/4. 1932. J. G. Robertson, Goethe und England. — *Id.* XX, 7/8. 1932. F. Karpf, Stand und Aufgaben der englischen Syntaxforschung. — M. J. Wolff, Richtlinien der Renaissancebewegung. — *Id.* XX, 9/10. 1932. F. Dannenberg, Peacock in seinem Verhältnis zu Shelley. — *Id.* XX, 11/12. 1932. E. Schmidt, Walter Scott. — *Id.* XXI, 1/2. 1933. F. Brie, Eugene O'Neill als Nachfolger der Griechen (Mourning becomes Electra). — *Id.* XXI, 3/4. 1933. O. Springer, Ortsnamen in der neuen Welt. — *Id.* XXI, 5/6. 1933. G. Buck, Das Nachleben Robert Brownings in Kritik und Forschung. — H. Lüdke, Neuhumanismus und Demokratie in amerikanischen Geistesleben.

**Die Neueren Sprachen.** XXXIX, 6. 1931. J. Libis, Wop. — *Id.* XXXIX, 7. 1931. G. Hübener, Ueber die Lage der Zeit und die Englandkunde. — R. Petsch, Die Kunsttheorie von Edgar Allan Poe. — *Id.* XXXIX, 8. 1931. J. Bihl, Zusammenhänge des Puritanismus. — H. Lötsch, Punch and Judy Show. — A. Paul, Der englische Unterricht im geiste der Völkerverständigung. — *Id.* XL, 1. 1932. K. H. Pfeffer, Die koloniale Situation Amerikas. — *Id.* XL, 2. 1932. I. Marinoff, „Imagination“ und „Reality“, ein Beitrag zur Welt- und Lebensanschauung des englischen Nachkriegsromans. — W. Franz, Shakespeare und Montage. — K. Schneider, Die Reform der englischen Schreibung im Anglic-System. — C. Stadler, Zur Entstehung des Ausdruckes "No Man's Land". — *Id.* XL, 3. 1932. H. Richter, Shakespearebetrachtungen im Goethejahr 1932. — *Id.* XL, 4. 1932. E. v. Schaubert, Zu Wordsworths Bedeutung für John Keats. — *Id.* XL, 5. 1932. H. Gauger, Die Bedeutung des Self-respect in dem englischen Persönlichkeitsideal. — F. Karpf reviews Van der Meer, *Main Facts concerning the Syntax of Mandeville's Travels*. — *Id.* XL, 6. 1932. M. Tau, James Joyce. — E. Leimert, Das Wesen des Cant. — M. Schubiger, Zum sog. level stress bei englischen Composita. — *Id.* XL, 7. 1932. G. Eichbaum, Die impressionistischen Frühgedichte Oscar Wildes unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Einflusses von James MacNeill Whistler. — G. Kirchner, Das moderne Indien und England. — K. Arns, William Poel. — K. Arns reviews de Vooy, *The Psychological Element in the English Sociological Novel*. — *Id.* XL, 8. 1932. P. Aronstein, George



Bernard Shaw als Persönlichkeit. — *Id.* XLI, 1. 1933. M. Mauk, Die Vereinigten Staaten von heute in ihren Hauptkomponenten. — G. Buck, Ueber Entwicklung und Methoden der Geschichte der englischen Literatur des Mittelalters. — *Id.* XLI, 2. 1933. P. Aronstein, Bernard Shaws Verhältnis zu Shakespeare. — *Id.* XLI, 3. 1933. R. Petsch, Eine neue Form des angelsächsischen Romans. — E. Riedel, Zur Silbentrennung im Englischen. — *Id.* XLI, 4. 1933. H. Rochocz, Hamlet für die deutsche Jugend. — W. Schmidt, Einige Grundbegriffe der neuenglischen Phonetik. — *Id.* XLI, 5. 1933. K. Schneider, Basic English.

**Zeitschrift für französischen und englischen Unterricht.** XXX, 8. 1931. E. Vowinkel, Katherine Mansfield. — *Id.* XXXI, 2. 1932. B. Fehr, England und das neue Denken. — *Id.* XXXI, 3. 1932. G. P. Gooch, An English view of Goethe. — F. Schönemann, Goethe in Amerika. — *Id.* XXXI, 4. 1932. H. Friedrich, Croces Aesthetik und Vosslers Sprachphilosophie. — *Id.* XXXI, 5. 1932. K. Arns, Proviktorianismus und Antiviktorianismus in der neuen englischen Literatur. — *Id.* XXXI, 2. 1933. H. Wohlenberg, Das englische Volkslied. — A. Kruse, Edward Thompson, ein Dichter des heutigen Indiens. — *Id.* XXXII, 4. 1933. H. Zeller, Die innere Sprachform im fremdsprachlichen Unterricht.

**Neuphilologische Mitteilungen.** XXXIII, 6/8. 1932. O. Basler, Eduard Sievers zum Gedenken. — Y. M. Biese, Die neuenglischen Ausdrücke des Werdens in sprachgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung. — *Id.* XXXIV, 1/2. 1933. U. Lindelöf, The Subject of the Gerund in present-day English.

**Neue Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Jugendbildung.** VII, 8. 1931. W. Fischer, Sinclair Lewis, der Nobelpreisdichter.

**Die Literatur.** XXXIII, 12. 1931. K. Arns, Der 5000. Tauchnitz-Band. — H. Fallada, Ernest Hemingway oder Woran liegt es? — *Id.* XXXIV, 4. 1932. K. Arns, Literarische Neuwertung im neuen England.

**Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie.** LII, 11/12. 1931. F. Wild reviews Vriend, The Blessed Virgin Mary in the Medieval Drama of England. — *Id.* LIII, 1/2. 1932. F. Asanger reviews Zandvoort, Sidney's Arcadia. — *Id.* LIII, 3/4. 1932. K. Glaser reviews Reesink, L'Angleterre et la littérature anglaise etc. — *Id.* LIV, 5/6. 1933. H. Mutschmann reviews Kruisinga, An Introduction to the Study of English Sounds, 5th ed. — *Id.* LIV, 7/8. A. Ludwig reviews Bosker, Literary Criticism in the Age of Johnson.

**Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur.** LV, 3. 1930. Ed. Sievers, Beowulf 3066 ff.

**Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung.** LX, 1/2. 1932. W. S[chulze], Afs. nænigra (nánra) Þinga.

**Dermatologische Wochenschrift.** XCIII, 41. 1931. K. Herxheimer, Shakespeare und die Hautkrankheiten.

**Euphorion.** XXXII, 2. 1931. J. Petersen, Schiller und Shakespeare.

**Die neue Rundschau.** XLIII, 4. 1932. J. Gundolf, Goethe und Walter Scott.

**Forschungen und Fortschritte.** VIII, 7/9. 1932. A. Brandl, Goethe und England.

# THE MERCHANT OF VENICE

## in the Eighteenth Century.

With the recent researches of such scholars as Professor Nichol Smith in England and Dr. R. W. Babcock in America, we are beginning to revise our ideas upon the eighteenth century's knowledge of Shakespeare. Indeed, instead of supposing, as most people did a generation ago, that in the ages of Pope and Johnson the great Elizabethan dramatist went unappreciated, we have now seriously to ask ourselves whether it was not the eighteenth century that discovered him. And if we cannot answer such a question with an unqualified affirmative, we shall be bound to admit, after due consideration of the evidence which our specialists have to put before us, that it went a good way in that direction. Yet in perusing the acting lists and the dramatic criticism of the early eighteenth century, one is struck by the fact that *The Merchant of Venice*, today one of the most popular and best known of Shakespeare plays, seems to have gone quite unregarded in its original form; and even an altered version did not prove so popular as might have been expected. Genest makes no mention of it before 1741<sup>1</sup>, and the only really important piece of criticism which refers to it before that date dismisses it in two or three sentences. Evidently it was considered as quite a minor play of Shakespeare, if it was considered at all.

This neglect, however, was not peculiar to the Augustan age. It had been inherited from the Restoration. It seems probable, indeed, that with Shakespeare's death in 1616 the play was virtually relegated to the limbo of oblivion, and it was left to the mid-eighteenth century to bring it to light once more. A few years ago Dr. S. A. Small conducted an examination into the fate of *The Merchant of Venice* upon the stage during the last three hundred years, and though the section upon the eighteenth century is far from satisfactory (being dismissed, indeed, in one or two paragraphs) he has some interesting facts to present about the Restoration. In the literature between the years 1616 and 1680 he has found twenty-five quotations from or reminiscences of *The Merchant of Venice*, but nothing whatever in the way of criticism; nor is there any evidence that the quotations show any close familiarity with the play, for most of them are of the type that might well have been handed down from Elizabethan times as household words of unknown origin. We must admit, of course, that the succeeding folios would familiarise a certain number of people with the text, but these would be comparatively few. Pepys, who was a regular visitor to the playhouse, seems never to have seen the play upon the stage, and Dryden, a professed student of Shakespeare, thought it scarcely worth mention. In the preface to his translation of Du Fresnoy's

<sup>1</sup> Though he sometimes puts Granville's *Jew of Venice* (see below) under the title *The Merchant of Venice*.

<sup>2</sup> S. A. Small: *Shakespearean Character Interpretation: The Merchant of Venice*. (Hesperia. Schriften zur Englischen Philologie, herausgegeben von James W. Bright. Göttingen. Heft 10, 1927.)

*De Arte Graphica* (1695) there is a mere passing reference to the capable handling of Shylock, but that is all; and this is the only mention of *The Merchant of Venice* throughout the whole of Dryden's work. In the later years of the Restoration era, two of the outstanding Shakespearean actors were Betterton and Sandford. In his *Apology* Colley Cibber writes enthusiastically of them both, enumerating the principal rôles in which their excellence was shown; but never once does he mention Shylock. Had the opportunity been presented, we may be sure that Betterton or Sandford would have acted this character, and that Cibber would have commented upon their performance of it. It seems likely, therefore, that Dr. Small is right when he declares that "it is very probable that *The Merchant of Venice* was never acted on the stage during the seventeenth century."

The honour of resuscitating it was to fall to the eighteenth century, though as was the case with so many other of Shakespeare's plays, it was in an altered and a mangled form that the contemporaries of Steele and Addison saw it. At the very opening of the century appeared *The Jew of Venice*, by George Granville, later Lord Lansdowne. With Betterton as Bassanio, and Doggett, the most famous comic actor of the day, as Shylock, it was first acted at Lincoln's Inn Fields in May 1701, and appeared upon the boards periodically for the next forty years. Now Granville was a "poet and patron of letters, politician and conspirator, jack of all trades, and completely master of none", as his most recent biographer has styled him<sup>1</sup>; he was also something of a dramatist, so that he was not altogether unqualified to judge of the public taste. But, belonging as he did rather to the school of Dryden than to that of the Elizabethan tradition, and having an irrepressible *flair* for parody, epigram and burlesque, he was about the last person to judge of the qualities of a Shakespearean play. To him, as to many more of his generation, Shakespeare was rude, impolite, and unpolished, and consequently he set out to give to *The Merchant of Venice* those nice finishing touches which only an Augustan knew how to bestow. From his preface it is quite obvious that Granville had no very great respect or admiration for his original.

"The foundation of the following comedy", he writes, "being liable to some objection, it may be wondered that anyone should make choice of it to bestow so much labour upon; but the judicious reader will observe so many manly and moral graces in the characters and sentiments, that he may excuse the story for the sake of the ornamental parts. Undertakings of this kind are justified by the examples of those great men who have employed their endeavours in the same way."

So in this spirit Granville set out to effect his revision. When the curtain went up on the first night, the audience was treated to a special prologue, written by Bevil Higgins, which took the form of a duologue between the ghosts of Shakespeare and of Dryden. There were several sarcastic references in it to "the stock-jobbing Jew", but most surprising of all was Shakespeare's candid admission of the superiority of this new version to his own.

These scenes in their rough nature-dress were mine,  
But now improv'd with nobler lustre shine;  
The first rude sketches Shakespeare's pencil drew,  
But all the shining master-strokes are new.

<sup>1</sup> Elizabeth Handasyde: *The Life of George Granville, Lord Lansdowne, 1666-1735*. (1933).



And what were these "shining master-strokes"? In the first place, there was a shifting of stress and an emphasising of those elements of plot and character to which the adaptor considered that Shakespeare had given insufficient prominence. Bassanio rose from a second-rate to a principal character, and the casket story became the principal plot, probably because, with its scope for sentimental development, it fell in naturally with the taste of the time. The scene between the two Gobbos was omitted, since it seemed to serve no useful purpose, while Shylock, although he now occupied a distinctly secondary rôle, was degraded to a rather loathsome buffoon, the object of ridicule of the whole audience. His interview with Tubal was dispensed with, either because its significance was not appreciated or because it was felt that it pleaded too strongly in his favour, but to compensate for this cut, Granville introduced a new scene of his own composition, giving a representation of Bassanio's farewell banquet and embodying a masque of *Peleus and Thetis*. While the others are enjoying themselves, Shylock sits sullenly apart, eating gluttonously and drinking a health to money!

There is no need to dwell longer upon this play. Its object is obvious: to whiten the character of Bassanio and to blacken that of Shylock. The very fact that Doggett was chosen to fill this latter rôle is significant. A few years later Downes mentions it in the *Roscius Anglicanus* as one of his greatest comic successes. But we must not be over-hasty in decrying Granville's effort. Of course, he had distorted the play; but he had not hacked at it so ruthlessly as many an adaptor hacked at Shakespeare. His Shylock was probably an exaggeration rather than a reversal of the Elizabethan Shylock, while he had certainly rescued the play from utter neglect.

The earliest piece of detailed criticism to appear on Shakespeare in the eighteenth century was Nicholas Rowe's *Some Account of the Life and Writings of Mr. William Shakespeare*, printed as a preface to his edition of the plays in 1709. Rowe had the original drama here before him, and he must have studied it in fair detail; he must also have been familiar with Granville's version, but he has nothing to say directly on the relative merits of the two. If, however, he never mentions Granville by name, it is evident that a comparison between his adaptation and the Shakespearean original is all the time at the back of his mind. With the author of *The Jew of Venice* he agrees that there are improbabilities in the plot; like him also, he is impressed by the sentimental aspect of Antonio's friendship for and devotion to Bassanio, and like him again, he praises the "manly and moral graces" (i.e. the didactic and moralising passages); though where Granville regarded his original as a "first rude sketch", Rowe considered it one of the most finished of Shakespeare's plays. "The play itself," he writes, "take it all together, seems to me to be one of the most finished of any of Shakespeare's. The tale indeed, in that part relating to the caskets and the extravagant and unusual kind of bond given by Antonio, is a little too much removed from the rules of probability. But taking the fact for granted, we must allow it to be very beautifully written. There is something in the friendship of Antonio to Bassanio very great, generous and tender. The whole fourth act, supposing, as I said, the fact to be probable, is extremely fine. But there are two passages that deserve a particular notice. The first is what Portia says in praise of mercy (Act IV), and the other on the power of music (Act V)." Then comes what is perhaps the most important remark in the whole of the essay, for it represents a view that was then distinctly heretical. "Tho' we have seen the play receiv'd and acted as a comedy", writes Rowe,

"and the part of the Jew performed by an excellent comedian, yet I cannot but think it was design'd tragically by the author". The "excellent comedian" was probably no other than Doggett, though we have it on the authority of John Bernard (*Retrospections of the Stage*. 1830. Vol. I., p. 89,) that both Tony Leigh and Cave Underhill made the part "a vehicle for most disgraceful buffoonery". Rowe's was a bold venture, and he found few or none that he could persuade to agree with him. Public and critics alike preferred Granville's interpretation, and in 1721 John Dennis, who had himself adapted *Coriolanus*, declared that his predecessor in the field had justly improved Shakespeare. "I would not give this encomium to *The Jew of Venice*", he concludes, "if I were not convinced, from a long experience of the penetration and force of your judgement, that no exaltation can make you asham'd of your former noble art."<sup>1</sup>

The honour of restoring the original play to the stage rests with the actor Charles Macklin, who, curiously enough, had never been conspicuous in Shakespearean rôles and had always been considered a comedian, whom Granville's Shylock would have suited admirably. He had played Peachum in *The Beggar's Opera*, Lord Foppington in Colley Cibber's *The Careless Husband*, Trappanti in the same author's *She Would and She Would Not*, and Marplot in Mrs. Centlivre's *The Busy Body*. Yet this very comedian was responsible for the banishment of the ridiculous travesty which had delighted audiences for the past forty years. It is highly probable that he, had wished to play Shylock for some time, having seen the dramatic possibilities inherent in the character, and particularly in the Tubal scene which was omitted from the more familiar version of the play. But he found difficulty in persuading Fleetwood, the manager of Drury Lane, to abandon Granville for Shakespeare. Finally, however, his persistence won, and the play appeared on February 14, 1741.<sup>2</sup> At first its fate hung in the balance, but before the evening was out the audience had shown its approbation, Macklin had made his name, and its success was assured for the next twenty-one nights. Several authorities have given descriptions of this notable performance, but I shall quote only three. The first is from Genest (*Some Account of the English Stage*. 1830. III, 627.)

"Macklin saw from the first that Shylock afforded a wide scope for the display of his abilities and the exhibition of capital acting: but he had a great deal to encounter and surmount. *The Jew of Venice* had for many years been received with approbation; the actors declared he would spoil the performance; Quin said he would be hissed off the stage for his presumption, and Fleetwood strenuously urged him to abandon his resolution. But Macklin, infinitely to the credit of his sound and acute discrimination, continued firm to his purpose, and *The Merchant of Venice* was announced for representation ... During the rehearsal Macklin did not let any person, not even the actors, see how he intended to act the part: he merely repeated the lines of the character, and did not so much as by one single look, tone, gesture or attitude, disclose the manner in which he meant to act it. He was sure he was right, but he was not quite sure of the kind of reception he might meet with. This circumstance, together with the unfavourable prognostics of the actors, reduced him to a state of the most painful anxiety. The theatre was crowded: when Bassanio and Shylock

<sup>1</sup> From the Dedication to *Original Letters, Familiar, Moral and Critical*. 2 vols. 1721.

<sup>2</sup> The cast on the first night was as follows: Shylock = Macklin; Antonio = Quin; Bassanio = Milward; Gratiano = Mills; Launcelot = Chapman; Lorenzo = Havard; Gobbo = Johnson; Morocco = Cashel; Arragon = Turbutt; Tubal = Taswell; Portia = Mrs. Clive; Nerissa = Mrs. Pritchard; Jessica = Mrs. Woodman.

entered there was an awful silence; a pin might have been heard if dropt upon the stage. Macklin has declared that nothing affected him so much as the coolness of the audience at his entrance; he had been accustomed to be received with plaudits, but on this occasion not a hand moved to encourage him. When, however, he had finished the speech in which Shylock declares his motives of antipathy to Antonio, the audience suddenly burst out into a thunder of applause, which continued louder and louder till the end of the play."

To this we can add the remarks of Kirkman (*Life of Macklin*. 1799. Vol. I., p. 259.)

"Never was performer's triumph more complete; never were enemies and opponents more confounded and abashed; never was a manager more agreeably surprised. The sudden, unexpected and happy catastrophe of the night's presentation, conferred on Mr. Macklin immortal fame as an actor ... There is no doubt that Mr. Macklin looked and spoke the part much better than any other person. In the level scenes his voice was most happily suited to that sententious gloominess of expression the author intended, which, with a sullen solemnity of deportment, marked the character strongly. During the interview with Tubal Mr. Macklin was inimitable. He broke the tones of utterance; he was at once malevolent and then infuriate, and then malevolent again; the transitions were strictly natural and the variations of his countenance admirable. In the dumb action of the trial scene he was amazingly descriptive, and through the whole displayed such an equal merit as justly entitled him to that very comprehensive though concise compliment paid him by Mr. Pope, who sat in the stage box on the third night of the representation, and who emphatically declared,

This is the Jew  
That Shakespeare drew."<sup>1</sup>

Finally there is Cooke's account of the production, given in his *Memoirs of Charles Macklin*, all the more valuable because Cooke was a personal friend of Macklin, and often one of his audience in the last few years before he retired from the stage, so that he may have had the story from the lips of the actor himself. It certainly has every appearance of being genuine.

"The long-expected night at last arrived, and the house was crowded from top to bottom with the first company in the town. The two front rows of the pit as usual, were full of critics, who, sir, said the veteran, "I eyed through the slit of the curtain, and was glad to see them, as I wished in such a case to be tried by a special jury. When I made my appearance in the Greenroom, dressed for the part, with my red hat on my head, my piqued beard, loose black gown etc., and with a confidence which I never before assumed, the performers all stared at one another, and evidently with a stare of disappointment. Well, sir, hitherto all was right till the last bell rang; then, I confess, my heart began to beat a little. However, I mustered up all the courage I could, and, recommending my cause to Providence, threw myself boldly on the stage, and was received by one of the loudest thunders of applause I ever before experienced.

The opening scenes being rather tame and level, I could not expect much applause, but I found myself well listened to. I could hear distinctly in the pit the words, "Very well—very well indeed! This man seems to know what he is about", etc. These encomiums warmed me, but did not overset me. I knew where I should have the pull, which was in the third act, and reserved myself accordingly. At this period I threw out all my fire, and, as the contrasted passions of joy for the merchant's losses and grief for the elopement of Jessica open a fine field for an actor's powers, I had the good fortune to please beyond my warmest expectations. The whole house was in an uproar of applause, and I was obliged to pause between the speeches to give it vent, so as to be heard. When I went behind the scenes after this act, the manager met me and complimented me very highly on my performance, and significantly added,

<sup>1</sup> The anecdote of Pope cannot be authenticated, and is probably apocryphal.



"Macklin, you was right at last." My brethren in the Greenroom joined in the eulogium, but with different views. He was thinking of the increase of his treasury; they only for saving appearances, wishing at the same time that I had broke my neck in the attempt. The trial scene wound up the fullness of my reputation. Here I was well listened to, and here I made such a silent yet forcible impression on my audience that I retired from this great attempt most perfectly satisfied. On my return to the Greenroom after the play was over, it was crowded with nobility and critics, who all complimented me in the warmest and most unbounded manner, and the situation I found myself in, I must confess, was one of the most flattering and intoxicating of my whole life. No money, no title could purchase what I felt. And let no man tell me after this what Fame will not inspire a man to do, and how far the attainment of it will not remunerate his greatest labours. By G—d, sir, though I was not worth fifty pounds in the world at that time, yet, let me tell you, I was Charles the Great for that night." "

Bernard, who considered the character Macklin's *chef d'œuvre*, thought that his natural physical appearance may have helped to make it the success that it was, and this certainly may have been so, but from the accounts handed down by his contemporaries it seems that it was not so much his external appearance, as his manner and his depiction of character and passions that impressed the audience; and that is where he differed essentially from his predecessors. Even to Macklin Shylock was probably not the poignantly tragic figure that modern criticism sees in him, but he was at least a serious character, of strong and positive personality, and so we can say, with a recent critic, that "the delineation of Macklin has been the basis of all successive interpretations."<sup>1</sup>

Once revived, the play became extraordinarily popular; indeed, the place that it occupies in Shakespearean repertory in the modern age dates from this time. Genest records productions in London every year up to 1747, and almost every year from 1750 to the end of the century. Oftentimes it appeared at two theatres during the same season. The Burney Collection of playbills in the British Museum (nine volumes of which refer to country theatres) show that it was equally popular in the provinces and formed part of the stock repertory of most of the larger itinerant companies. Tate Wilkinson acted Shylock at Birmingham in 1778 and Brunton took the same part at Norwich in 1789, while in 1799 Mrs. Siddons appeared as Portia at Bath. A bill for Lynn, dated March 29, 1776, gives *The Jew of Venice* as the title of the principal play for the evening. Was it a revival of Granville's comedy, or merely a mistake in the title? In London, certainly, Granville's adaptation was never seen upon the stage, once it was banished by Macklin, but still occasionally we find actors and managers, while adhering to Macklin's Shylock in the main details, making minor alterations of their own. From Francis Gentleman's *Dramatic Censor* (1770. Vol. I., p. 281.), for instance, we learn that the scene in which the Duke of Morocco makes his choice of the caskets was frequently omitted in representation, while we know that Mrs. Clive's Portia always tended to become a travesty of the Shakespearean heroine through the actress' inability to refrain from introducing broad humour into the rôle and aping the mannerisms of well known lawyers. *The Dramatic Censor* also tells us that throughout the first three-quarters of the century, never was there anyone who could play Shylock better than Macklin. King was wanting in impressiveness, and Yates, affecting as he did "a quaint,

<sup>1</sup> Clarence Stratton: *Act Four of the Merchant of Venice on the Stage*. (Schelling Anniversary Papers. 1923. pp. 301-310.)

snip-snap mode of expression", was "contemptible". Reddish made the best Antonio, Palmer the best Gratiano, while Bassanio never found a really satisfactory exponent. Mrs. Woffington, our authority considers, carried off the laurel for Portia. "While in petticoats she show'd the woman of solid sense and real fashion; when in breeches, the man of education, judgement and gentility."

As would be expected, the revival of the play upon the stage turned the attention of the scholars and critics to it, and in the Shakespearean literature which appeared after 1750 we find a rise in its status as a *pièce de théâtre* and as a study of what the eighteenth century pleased to call "nature"; i.e., the human emotions and affections. Thomas Warton, one of the earliest of our literary scholars in the modern sense of the word, started a new interest in the sources of the play by a reference in his *Observations on Spenser's Faerie Queene* to an old ballad about a Jew and a pound of flesh, which he suggested was founded on an Italian novel, known, possibly, to Shakespeare. Immediately this aroused widespread interest, and in *The Connoisseur* for May 16, 1754, the text of the ballad was reprinted as *A Ballad Shewing the Crueltie of Gernutus, a Jew, Who, lending to a Marchant an Hundred Crownes, Would Have a Pound of his Flesh, because he Could not Pay him at the Time Appointed*. But the author of the paper (possibly Thomas Percy) dissented from Warton in the matter of the source of the ballad. It was founded, he thought, not on a novel, but on a passage in the *Life of Pope Sixtus V.*, which tells how a Jew pledged a pound of his flesh to a Christian as a wager. When the forfeiture fell due, the Pope was called in as arbiter and though he allowed the creditor to exact his bond, warned him that, upon pain of dire penalties, he must take not a scruple more nor less than his pound. The paper concludes with a tribute to Shakespeare's skill in weaving together several plots, and to the manner in which "the close of the story is finely heightened" — for in the ballad there is nothing to suggest the dramatic intensity of the trial scene. The substance of this paper appeared also in *The Gentleman's Magazine* for May, 1754, signed with the initials T.S., while in the July number of the same journal (p. 311.) a certain "Palaeophilus" came out in support of Warton.

Lord Kames selected *The Merchant of Venice* as the "text" for a discourse in *The Elements of Criticism* (1762), though he was mainly interested in the lesser characters and in Shakespeare's general artistic methods. His criticism is not profound, and never does he come down to the vital problems of the play, but his mode of treatment is typical of a method of approach to Shakespeare which was very common in his day. He commends what he calls the "natural" portrayal of Antonio's melancholy in the first scene, and makes much of the dramatist's power of revealing a person's character in a single short speech either by him or about him. Particularly is this so in the case of Gratiano, whose speech, "Let me play the fool" etc. (Act I., Sc. i.), Kames declares, sums him up in a few lines. And then there is an observation which shows how far this age could go in looking for morality in Shakespeare's plays. Launcelot's rather diffuse banter as he is attempting to make up his mind to run away from Shylock (Act II, Sc. ii.) is held up as a supreme example of the conflict of good and evil, of duty and self-interest, in the mind of the individual!

If we now skip eight years, and come to Francis Gentleman's essay in *The Dramatic Censor* (1770. Vol. I., pp. 278-98) we find again a similar

method of approach. High praise is given to Shakespeare's apt choice of similes, and especially of that in the first scene, when Bassanio compares his various financial ventures to the schoolboy sport of archery; in Act. I, Sc. ii, where Portia confides her position to Nerissa, there is "a pleasing peculiarity of sentiment", while the encounter between Tubal and Shylock is pronounced highly dramatic. The writer does, however, find certain faults in the play. Nerissa's match-making is somewhat precipitate, Gobbo is a little too free in his speech in the presence of ladies, and the reference to Jacob's method of ensuring an increase in his flocks is indelicate. In Portia's famous speech in the fourth act, the phrase *we do pray for mercy*, "as it evidently refers to the Lord's Prayer, ought not to have been even hinted at where a Jew was in question, as it would rather work an irritative than a lenitive effect." As for Shylock, there is no mistaking the author's attitude towards him. "Flinty-hearted", "the usurer to a hair", "a fawning sycophant", "a thorough-paced villain" are some of the phrases he uses of him, while he even goes so far as to blame Shakespeare for not showing him more malevolent and painting him in blacker colours than he has in the scene in which he bids farewell to Jessica before departing for the banquet. He does concede, however, that in Antonio's "hating his nation and personally reviling him, lay a just foundation for dislike"; but he will not let that weigh in the Jew's favour, for he continues: "Shylock is a most disgraceful picture of humanity ... All shade, not a gleam of light; subtle, selfish, fawning, irascible, tyrannic ... The wretched state to which he is in his turn reduced is so agreeable a sacrifice to justice that it conveys inexplicable satisfaction to every feeling mind."

When he has said all that he has to say upon the defects of the play, he concludes upon a laudatory note. "Our author has as few superfluities or censurable passages in his *Merchant of Venice* as in any piece he ever wrote; and if it is not among the most powerful efforts of his genius, it certainly yields precedence to very few, either in the study or the theatre."

Mrs. Griffiths (*The Morality of Shakespeare's Drama*, 1775) sees "morality" written in large letters throughout the play, and repeats Lord Kames' absurdity about Launcelot's soliloquy. William Whateley makes no mention whatever of *The Merchant of Venice* in his *Remarks on Some of Shakespeare's Characters* (1785); but we have to bear in mind that, according to the editor, this book consisted of "fragments only of a greater work", which the author never lived to complete. Had he carried it through to its conclusion, we should probably have had one more critical document to consider here. George Coleman's *Remarks on Shylock's Reply to the Senate of Venice* (*Prose on Several Occasions*, II, 189.) is taken up purely with textual discussion, while William Richardson's *Philosophical Analysis of Some of Shakespeare's Characters* (1774) ignores the play. True, this last work claims to consider only the tragic characters, but some thirty-two pages are devoted to Jaques and thirty to Imogen, so that apparently, so far as Richardson was concerned, both of these could more justifiably be classed as tragic than could Shylock.

But it was not long before the critical world was to be startled into attention by a bold and heretical pronouncement which was destined to anticipate the modern point of view in more ways than one. In 1796 appeared a volume of *Essays by a Society of Gentlemen at Exeter*. They dealt with a variety of subjects, but two of them, by Richard Hole, were on Shakespearean topics, and were entitled *An Apology for the Character and Conduct of Iago*. and *An Apology for the Character and Conduct of Shylock* respectively. It is with



the second of these that we are concerned. It is a well written essay, and Hole marshals his arguments forcefully and with care. In judging of Shylock, he urges, we must forget his Jewish nationality. Suppose the case had been reversed, and that Shylock had subjected Antonio to the same indignities and insults to which he himself has been subjected; what would have been Antonio's attitude? He would probably have retaliated. Yet Shylock bears them with a patient shrug. Or again, in the Shylock-Tubal scene, imagine that a Christian merchant had been the injured party and had his daughter and his money stolen from him by a young Jewish gallant; where would the sympathies of the audience lie? Besides, he reminds his readers, "we ought not to try Shylock by our laws and standards, but by the laws and standards of the community to which he belonged". According to the religion of Moses "an eye for an eye" was strict morality, and was no more disgraceful than was suicide to a defeated Roman; nor was usury considered degrading. "It is no less absurd to condemn a Jew for usury than a Mahomedan for polygamy." Shylock, indeed, stands in a strong position. "He does not appear knowingly to violate any human or divine law, but boldly avers, in conscious integrity, before a court of judicature, that he dreads no judgement, doing no wrong." That Shakespeare meant to represent him as a villain, Hole does not deny, but he regards this not as a discredit to Shylock, but to Shakespeare.

"Were any of Shylock's countrymen poets", he concludes, "I am convinced they would represent him in a very different light, and indeed a much fairer one than that in which he appears to us. They would most probably convert his story into a deep tragedy, and by giving it a different catastrophe, softening some hard expressions, and introducing others of a pathetic kind, interest every sentimental and tender-hearted descendant of Abraham in his favour."

As might be expected, Hole's essay was not received with enthusiasm. *The Monthly Review* (January, 1797,) was willing to go part of the way with the author, but declared that "though we think Shakespeare highly blameable for the sacrifice which he has made to bigotry and the spirit of persecution, we cannot doubt that he has succeeded in painting a really detestable character; and the apology here made for Shylock ... is no more than the universal plea that may be made for revenge in its most abominable forms. As a usurer, indeed, he cannot consistently be an object of abhorrence in a land of stock-jobbers, but as an insidious contriver of murder we hope that he will never be regarded with a mitigated detestation."

*The British Critic* (April, 1797) was even more outspoken in its condemnation. "It is not an apology", this journal declares, "but merely an extenuation. We cannot but reprobate these fanciful attempts to palliate characters which the poet either meant to make odious or had written foolishly. To tell us that the characters which all readers and spectators of his dramas have felt to be detestable are not so, and that it remains to this day to be explained what they really are, is no less than to say that he knew not how to make the impressions he intended on his hearers and readers; in other words, that he is no dramatic poet. These attempts, whatever ingenuity there may be in them, are the bane of true criticism. An endeavour made some years ago to prove Falstaff no coward, has probably led to these idle efforts."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A reference to Maurice Morgann's *Essay on the Dramatic Character of Sir John Falstaff* (1777).

Only *The Universal Magazine* had much to say in favour of the essay, and that it should have found approval in this quarter is not surprising, for only a few months before (October, 1796) the same periodical had published some comments upon the play in which, though it had not sought to apologise for Shylock, it had contended that he was not a typical Jew, and that Shakespeare had never intended to represent him as such. "The treatment which the Jews have experienced for many years past, reflects great discredit on the Christian world", avers this writer, and concludes by holding up Cumberland's *Sheva* as more truly representative. The same point was made by David Levi in his *Dissertations on the Prophecies of the Old Testament* (1798. Vol. I., Preface, p. xxxiv.) "Has not a great master of nature drawn the portrait of a Jew in a most detestable character?" asked Levi; to which *The British Critic* (1798. Vol. xii. p. 45.) retorted, "If Shakespeare were indeed a great master of nature, there is some probability that the character he has portrayed is not altogether unnatural." This attitude was, of course, still widespread; but Hole had made a few converts, and the new criticism was gradually growing. In his *Life of Macklin* (1799) Kirkman sarcastically hurled Francis Gentleman's words back at him: "We cordially co-incide with an eminent critic, who says that Shylock is a most disgraceful picture of human nature. He is drawn what we think no man ever was, all shade, not a gleam of light; subtle, selfish, fawning, irascible, tyrannic." In other words, he is a character which is not true to life, and his continuous baiting by the Christians makes him more sinned against than sinning. Thus, first on the stage and then in criticism, Shylock had risen from the mere buffoon to a figure surrounded by dignity and tragic grandeur.

Sheffield.

FREDERICK T. WOOD.

## Notes and News.

**The Date of "The History of Jacob and Esau".** In the year 1568 Henry Bynneman printed the interlude *The History of Jacob and Esau*. However, the play was in existence at least ten years before. From the *Accounts of the Wardens of the Stationers' Company*, preserved at The Stationers' Hall, London, (Register A, fo. 23a) it appears that between July 1557 and the same month of 1558 permission was given:

To henry Sutton to prynte an enterlude vpon the history of Jacobe and Esawe out of the xxvij chapeter of the fyrste boke of moyses Called genyses .....<sup>1</sup>

The latest date for the composition of the play is, therefore, 1557-1558; the earliest had never been settled till we made the discovery which forms the subject of the present note. The author did not write his interlude before 1539, for he depends on the 1539 edition of Calvin's *Institutio Christianae Religionis*.

The playwright vindicates the theory of predestination according to

<sup>1</sup> The passage has also been copied by E. Arber in *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London. 1554-1640*. 5 vol. London, 1875-1894. vol. i, p. 77.





## Corrigendum.

*English Studies*, Vol. XV, October 1933, p. 161 ff.

- a. On p. 161 a note should have been added to the effect that *charitee* owes its *ch* to another dialect than East-Norman or Picardian.
- b. The numbers of the letters in the *Literæ Cantuarienses* referred to on p. 167 should have been given in Arabic notation.
- c. Note 5, p. 171. Instead of "*Diamond* seems to be the only word" read: "*Almond* and *diamond* seem to be the only words."

A.

W. v. d. G.

## Reviews.

*The Theory of Speech and Language*. By A. H. GARDINER.  
322 pp. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1932. 10 s. 6 d.

Der als Aegyptologe bekannte Verfasser bietet hier den ersten Band einer geplanten Reihe von Werken zur allgemeinen Sprachtheorie. Wie der Titel bekundet, ist der Saussuresche Gegensatz von Sprache und Rede zu Grunde gelegt. Zugleich nimmt der Verf. die Anschauungen H. Pauls und besonders Ph. Wegeners — dem Andenken dessen das Buch gewidmet ist — wieder auf. Bestimmend für das Wesen der Sprache ist das Schema Sprecher — Hörer, woraus als Wesenseigenschaft die "purposiveness" der Sprache fließt. Den letzten Grund für die Existenz der Sprache erblickt der Verf. in der Unmöglichkeit des individuellen Bewusstseins, die eigenen Grenzen zu überschreiten und anders als durch die Vermittlung sinnlicher Zeichen mit dem Mitmenschen Kontakt zu haben.

Diese Grundsätze sind an sich nicht neu, neu aber ist die Art ihrer Verbindung und besonders die fruchtbare Verwendung des Schemas: Sprache—Rede auf die Gegensätze Spracheinheit und Redeeinheit, die Deutung von Subjekt und Prädikat als Redeeinheiten, von den Wortarten als Elementen des objektiven Bestandes der Sprache. Die vielerörterte Frage nach der Existenz des Einzelwortes rückt hierdurch in ein überraschendes Licht: das Einzelwort existiert in der Sprache, der Satz existiert in der Rede. Beide stellen "units", aber auf verschiedenem Plane dar. Die Sicherung des Wortes sowohl theoretisch als durch den Nachweis, dass auch im Bewusstsein von sprachwissenschaftlich Ungeschulten das Wort als Element eine Rolle spielt, erscheint als besonders gelungen gegenüber den von gestaltpsychologischer Seite kommenden Uebertreibungen, die die Nichtigerklärung des Wortes nahezulegen scheinen. Eine gleiche nüchterne Mässigung und begriffliches Unterscheidungsvermögen zeigt der Verf. in seiner Kritik des Bestrebens, die Wortarten zu revolutionnieren. Die äusserlich-behavioristische Art der Bestimmung der grammatischen Kategorien, wie sie etwa bei Jespersen in seiner berühmten Polemik mit Sonnenschein hervortritt, wird von Gardiner mit Hinweis auf das im Sprachbewusstsein lebende Gefühl für die inneren Unterscheidungen abgelehnt. Freilich erhebt sich hier das Bedenken, inwiefern das Gefühl im Stande sei in allgemeingültiger Weise die inneren Formen zu

erkennen und wie weit sich gerade das Gefühl von Beeinflussung durch die grammatische Tradition freizuhalten vermag. Die Probe wird erst durch die vom Verf. für einen weiteren Band versprochene Erörterung der Frage nach der Kasuszahl im Englischen geliefert werden.

In den genetischen Ansichten schliesst sich Gardiner stark an Paul an: die Rede ist die Quelle aus der die Sprache genährt wird, indem der individuelle Gebrauch durch Verallgemeinerung zum Gesetz wird, das nunmehr den individuellen Usus normiert. In der ausführlichen Satzlehre trifft besonders die Art, wie Verf. die Entwicklung von Subjekt und Prädikat und die Differenzierung zwischen grammatischem und logischem Subjekt unter Einfluss der Kultur und höheren Sprachbildung entspringen lässt. Eine kritische Durchmusterung der Satztheorien von Paul, Wundt, Bühler, Jespersen, Ries unterstützt die eigenen Thesen des Verf.

Das reichhaltige, mit grosser Klarheit und Stoffbeherrschung geschriebene Buch ist eine wahre Bereicherung der sprachtheoretischen Literatur und jedem Philologen zu empfehlen, der durch das Studium der allgemeinen Fragen seinen Blick zu erweitern bestrebt ist. Verf. vertritt den methodischen Standpunkt dass die Muttersprache der beste Ausgangspunkt für die allgemeine Sprachtheorie ist. Seine Ausführungen erhalten dadurch eine eigentümliche Forme und Lebendigkeit, die begriffliche Strenge ist mit literarischer Formgebung verbunden. Der Stoff ist in bewusster Weise nach zwei Seiten hin beschränkt gehalten: nach unten hin, insofern auf phonetische Betrachtungen verzichtet wurde; Verf. beschränkt sich ja auf "semantics." Hier wird künftig die Phonologie, die gerade eine neue Verbindung des Lautmaterials mit der Semantik herstellt, heranzuziehen sein. Nach oben hin lassen Gardiner's Ausführungen einstweilen den Zusammennang der Sprache mit anderen Symbolgebieten und die Bestimmung ihrer Bedeutung für die Entwicklung des geistigen Lebens überhaupt vermissen. Die von Verf. als Krönung seiner Arbeit angekündigte linguistische Logik wird hier manches nachholen können. Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Cassirer's Theorie der symbolischen Formen wird da auch am Platze sein. Im vorliegenden Band sucht man die Cassirerschen Arbeiten vergeblich. Einstweilen wird der nächste Teil die Wortarten und weitere grammatische Kategorien des näheren erörtern.

Wenn der Verf. in der Zusammenfassung auf den Absichtscharakter der Rede als auf ein Hauptergebnis Nachdruck legt, so wäre zu bemerken, dass die von Bühler gemachte Dreiteilung der Funktionen der Rede sich nur zwangsläufig unter die "purposiveness" unterbringen lassen dürfte. Sowohl die Kundgabe als die Darstellung sprengen das Schema: Sprecher—Hörer. Gardiner's Bemühen, hier alles unter einen Begriff zu bringen, hängt wohl mit einseitiger Statik in der Auffassung und Begriffsbildung zusammen: eine mehr dynamische Begriffsprägung, wie die Cassirersche, würde die betreffenden Phänomene in Reihen auseinanderlegen, wo Minima und Maxima ihre Stelle erhalten und in der kontinuierlichen Grenzüberschreitung sowohl die Differenz der Erscheinungen als ihr Zusammenhang gewahrt bleiben.

*Die Verwendung des Konjunktivs im Altenglischen.* Von Dr. HANS GLUNZ. Leipzig, Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1930. XVI + 144 pp. Price M. 10.

This is an interesting and highly suggestive study, different from anything that has been written so far on the subjunctive in Old English. The plan usually adopted in works dealing with Old English syntax is simply to pigeonhole the various cases in which a given construction or grammatical form is used. Dr. Glunz does not do any pigeonholing; what he does is to examine the contents of the fairly numerous compartments filled by others, with a view to determining why in sentences or clauses belonging to a given group the subjunctive was used in Old English. Wherever necessary or expedient he draws comparative material from Middle and Modern English, or from other languages.

In a short introduction Dr. Glunz discusses the subjunctive and the optative in Indo-Germanic and in Germanic. He distinguishes two functions of the subjunctive in Germanic, and accordingly distinguishes, *a*, the subjunctive of interest, and *b*, the conditional subjunctive. The former represents the Indo-Germanic subjunctive in its volitive function, and the Indo-Germanic optative in its genuine optative and its prescriptive function, while in the latter the deliberative and the prospective function of the Indo-Germanic subjunctive, and the potential function of the Indo-Germanic optative have coalesced.

This twofold division is the Author's lodestar throughout the book. In Chapter I he endeavours to show that in sentences and clauses expressing commands or wishes (including unreal and so-called pious wishes), in relative and final clauses, and in certain conditional and concessive clauses, it is always the element of interest that forms the underlying principle upon which the subjunctive is employed. In Chapter II, on the subjunctive of conditional possibility, it is constantly the element of potentiality that constitutes the starting point of the Author's argumentations. The subjects handled in this chapter are dubitative questions, certain conditional clauses, potentiality in head clauses, *swa* clauses, the subjunctive after comparatives and in more or less phantastic comparisons (*as if* clauses), statements of an emotional nature (in connection with verbs expressing joy, grief, fear, etc.), clauses connected with verbs like *to seem*, *to imagine*, etc., and finally the subjunctive in indirect statements and questions. The last chapter is concerned with the history of the subjunctive in Old English; the greater part of it is taken up by the periphrasis of the subjunctive by means of auxiliaries.

Although Dr. Glunz's statements are bound to be more or less speculative, not to say highly debatable, here and there, yet they will, generally speaking, also impress those students of historical syntax who always like to have the comfortable feeling of standing with both feet on firm ground. If Dr. Glunz does not at once succeed in "flashing conviction right into the hearts of the heathen", and in making their conceptions and opinions swing over in his direction, he will, at any rate, set them thinking, even when his reasoning is based on assumptions, rather than on demonstrable facts.

It is not easy to illustrate the way Dr. Glunz operates with assumptions, as this cannot be done without quoting or translating long passages. I will, therefore, only give two instances.

On p. 94 an attempt is made to account for the subjunctive in *he fægnað*,



*þæt he sie abisgod mid woruldðingum*, C. P. 128.3. The reasoning is, in outline, as follows. If the contents of a sentence result from a mental disposition, an emotion, they depend upon this emotion, in the same way as the apodosis of a conditional sentence is, in point of sense, dependent upon the protasis. Now if the speaker puts the clause in the subjunctive, he thereby expresses the dependence of this clause upon something uncertain and doubtful. The reality of the emotion appears to him uncertain at the least, if it is not to be rejected altogether. In a sentence like the one quoted the indicative is used in German. To a German the emotion denoted by the word 'Freude' is a reality. In German the fundamental idea is, "He is occupied with worldly things, and this gives him joy." To the Anglo-Saxon's mind, however, joy was something non-existent, something not conceived as having any form or shape, colour, etc. .... "Wenn von etwas Derartigem eine Sachlage "abhängt," wenn sprachlich der Gegenstand einer so aufgefassenen Gemütsbewegung durch einen Nebensatz zum Ausdruck kommt, so ist der Konjunktiv das äussere Ausdrucksmittel für dieses Verhältnis." The assumption that to an Anglo-Saxon an emotion was not a reality, now enables the Author to account for the use of the subjunctive in clauses depending on verbs that denote shame, grief, care or fear. About two dozen instances are given.

There is a weak point in Dr. Glunz's reasoning. If it is true that the subjunctive in the sentence quoted from the *Pastoral Care* is due to the fact that joy was unreal to an Anglo-Saxon, it follows that the indicative could not be used in connection with *fægnian*. The following quotations, however, tell a different tale. *Boeth. Lays XXIX.* 93, *hi ... fægnað þæt hiora fæder wa[ld]eð*, cf. *Boeth.* 136.20, *hi ... fægnað þæs þæt he hiora wealt*. *Ælfr. Hom.* II. 32, *þæt folc ... fægnodon þæt heo wæs þam breðer gelic*. Compare also *Past. C.* 126.19 (= 127.19), *Monige ... fægnað ðæs ðæt hie ða habbað to begonganne*. *Boeth.* 68.19, *þæs he sceal fægnian ðæt hi him soð an seggað*. — Further, it should be observed that the indicative is found in connection with other verbs of emotion as well. *Blickl. Hom.* 47.30, *þæt folc ne sceal forhyccgan þæt hi to him hi geeafmedon*. — *Ælfr. Hom.* II, 168, *þa astrehte se Riggo hine to eorþan mid eallum his geferum swiþe forhtigende, þæt hi his fandian dorston*. — *Genesis* 816, *Nu me mæg hreowan þæt ic bæd God*. — *Compl. of the Fallen Angel (Christ and Satan)* 247, *þa me þæs ofþuhte, þæt se þeoden wæs strang and stiðmod*. — *Orosius* 52.18, *Se þa, mid ðon þe he geweox, him þa ofþyncendum and ðæm Persum þæt he on his eames anwealde wæron and on þara Meða, ac hie gewin uphofan*. — *Ibid.* 80.23, *Xersis, swiþe him þa ofþyncendum þæt his folc swa ofslægen wæs, he self þa þærto for*. — *Past. C.* 232.20, *þa ofðuhte him ðætte men wæron to ðæm gescapene*. — *Blickl. Hom.* 175.20, *þæm ofþynceþ þæt hie synd Iudea folces*. — *Ælfr. Be Hester* 274, *þa oflicode þam cyninge þæt he læg hire swe gehende*.

These fairly numerous exceptions (?) make one suspect that, however sound Dr. Glunz's argumentation may seem, there must be something wrong about it. Perhaps the Anglo-Saxons did not always keep to the regulation attitude of mind towards joy, grief, and other emotions!

Another example, taken from p. 115 f. — "Interessant ist auch die spätere Entwicklung der konditionalen Verwendung des Konjunktivs gegen das Neuenglische hin. Der Konjunktiv wird seltener zugunsten des Indikativs. Der Sinn für die Wirklichkeit der Bedingung und ihres Inhalts steigert sich noch mehr. Aber der Wille, der Trieb in der menschlichen Seele wird nicht

mehr in den Vordergrund des sprachlichen Ausdrucks gerückt. Das zeigt sich sogar in der sog. "irrealen Bedingung", die *ae.* und *me.* den Konjunktiv Präteriti erforderte, die nun in den Indikativ gesetzt wird (selbst im Präteritum des Verbum substantivum, wo sich am längsten *were*, der alte Konjunktiv, erhalten hatte, und sich zuweilen noch findet)". After giving a quotation in which *was* is used twice instead of *were*, the Author goes on to say, "Die Zeit der Entstehung dieser indikativischen Konstruktion ist der 17. Jahrhundert (Pepys, Bunyan). Vielleicht ist in der geistigen Struktur dieser Zeit die Ursache für den auffallenden Wandel zu suchen. Alle Bedingungen werden nun mit nüchternen Augen angesehen; sie sind nicht mehr gewollt, befohlen, gewünscht, erbeten, erwartet, herbeigesehnt, sondern als wirklich gesetzt, in die Aussenwelt übertragen, objektiv und leidenschaftlos betrachtet".

I frankly own that all this is beyond me. Surely, we are not expected to believe that the matter-of-fact-ness of the seventeenth century Englishman made him represent an unreal condition as a reality, and that for this reason he said, "If I was you ...", instead of, "If I were you ...". Dr. Glunz coolly ignores the fact that already in later Middle English and in the sixteenth century there was a tendency to replace *were* by *was* in the indicative, and that in the seventeenth and the eighteenth century this substitution was extended to the subjunctive as well. Later on *was* lost its 'usurped' position again in Standard English; in 'vulgar' English and in dialects [*if*] *we* (*you, they*) *was*, [*if*] *there was* lots of *fruit*, etc. are still quite usual. There are many instances of this *was* in *Gyants Pilgrim's Progress*<sup>1</sup>. Here are a few. I, 181, *We was beset with Gyant Bloody-man, Gyant Maul, and Gyant Slay-good.* — II, 76, *I suppose you was in a dream.* — II, 175, *I wonder you was not weary.* — I, 160, *They was then asked, If they knew the Prisoner at the Bar?* — II, 157, *they marvelled ... that men of that Knowledg and ripeness of Wit as they was, should be so blinded.* — II, 175, *there was with his company, them that was feeble and weak.* — II, 193, *Here, because they was weary, they betook themselves to Rest.*

Here and there statements are made that will not bear close scrutiny. Thus on p. 115 Dr. Glunz concludes a detailed, rather speculative treatment of the subjunctive in *gif* clauses by placing in juxtaposition *gif þu Godes sunu sy* (*W. S. Gospels*), and *Orm's gif þatt tu Godess sune arrt* (11339). "Dort eine schematisch überkommene Form, für die die grammatische Kategorie "Konjunktiv in *gif*-Sätzen" eine Regel ist, hier der Sinn für die Wirklichkeit, dem sich das grammatische Schema unterordnet. Diese Entwicklung ist allerdings in der *ae.* Zeit noch nicht soweit gediehen. Man erkennt hier nur eben die Anfänge, und das bemerkenswerterweise zuerst bei den Gebildeten, den Klerikern". It is true that *gif þu Godes sunu sy* occurs in the Gospels, namely in *Matt. IV. 3*, and *XXVII. 40*, and in *Luke IV. 3*, and *IV. 9*. It is, however, remarkable that, while *Luke IV. 9* has, *Gyf þu sy Godes Sunu, asend þe heonan nyðer*, the corresponding verse in *Matt. IV. 6* reads, *Gyf þu Godes Sunu eart, asend þe þonne nyðer*. Further, *Luke XXIII. 37*, *Gif þu si ludea Cyning, gedo be halne*, should be compared with *Luke XXIII. 39*, *Gif þu Crist eart, gehæl þe soðfne and unc*. We even find both the subjunctive and the indicative after *gif* in the same verse, as in *John XII. 26*, *Gif hwa þenige me, fylige me; and min þen bið þær þær ic com. Gif me hwa þenað*.

<sup>1</sup> Facsimile Reproduction of the First Edition, London, Elliot Stock, 1875.

*nin Fæder hine wurðað.* It is doubtful whether the subjunctive after *gif* meant anything particular to the translator(s) of the Gospels. In the four Gospels there are only about 20 instances of the subjunctive in *gif* clauses, against at least 115 cases in which the indicative is employed.

The following assertion is found on p. 132, "*Nyle gee speke, as hethene men doon* Wicklif Mt 6.7 entstand aus *as hethene men speken*, das zerlegt wurde in *speken don*, wo *speken* dann als leicht in Gedanken ergänzbar fortgelassen wurde". This explanation might have been right, if vicarious *do* had come into use in Middle English. Vicarious *do*, however, was already used in Old English, but there is no evidence to prove that the Anglo-Saxons mentally supplied an infinitive after it: the *do* + infinitive combination, as used in Middle English, was unknown to them; at any rate it does not appear to be recorded in Old English.

The statement quoted above from p. 132 is followed by a sentence that makes one think of the egg of Columbus. "Nicht anders sind auch die zusammengesetzten Tempora zu verstehen: *ic cwom* = *ic eom cumen*, *ic nom* = *ic hæbbe genumen*." This is simplicity itself: still one cannot help feeling some diffidence as to the correctness of this explanation.

Dr. Glunz tackles every problem connected with the subjunctive, and his ingenuity practically always enables him to suggest a solution. But it would be risky to predict that all his theories will at once meet with general acceptance. Many of his readers, however appreciative their attitude towards his study may be, will probably apply the Scotch verdict 'not proven' to some of his pronouncements.

The reading of Dr. Glunz's book is not an easy task. This is, of course, largely owing to the somewhat abstruse nature of his subject, but also to some extent to his partiality for long, involved, sentences. I have noted several that take up from seven to ten closely printed lines.

Amsterdam.

W. VAN DER GAAF.

*England und die Antike.* Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg. IX Band. Vorträge 1930—1931. Mit 30 Lichtdrucktafeln. XII + 304 pp. Leipzig, Teubner, 1932. Geh. RM. 18.—.

The series of lectures which are assembled in this book aim at showing the classical influence in England. They vary in subject, but are connected by the underlying idea which governs the research work of scholars in very different fields. The book begins with a very illuminating essay by E. F. Jacob, the well-known Professor of History in Manchester and author of a book on "The Baronial Reform, 1258/64". With scrupulous care and great attention to details he traces back Latin-Christian culture to the seventh century ("Some Aspects of Classical Influence in Medieval England"), and shows how greatly the development of architecture and literature was dependent on Roman influence. The monastic schools of Yarrow and York were famous for the intimate knowledge of the classical writers, whereas Winchester School was more interested in classical art than in literature.

E. S. XV. 1933.



Prof. Jacob draws the conclusion that it was the Rhenish school of art culminating in the palace school of Aachen that mediated this classical influence. This is an idea which is indeed well worth considering. From this angle another problem might be solved, which, however, is not attacked by the author. The strong revival of the classical spirit in the second half of the seventh and the beginning of the eighth century strengthens the evidence of Prof. Brandl's thesis that the epic poem "Beowulf" has for its model the deeds of Hercules as told by Virgil. This Roman poet was to be found not only in the libraries of York and Yarrow, but all over the country his "Eneis" was one of the best known books in the clerical circles of that time (cf. Bishop Aldhelm's treatise "De metris", recently re-edited by Ehwald, 1913/19). Furthermore, Prof. Jacob's thesis concerning the Rhenish influence in England is confirmed by the research work of Prof. Brandl, who in his essay "Beowulf and die Merovinger" (1929) gives a very interesting survey of the dynastic relations between the two countries. — The second influence of classical culture which took place in the 12th century, culminated in the works of Laurence of Durham and Joseph of Exeter, who wrote verses after the model of Ovid. In this connection Prof. Jacob points out that the old chronological division between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance is clearly impossible. He supports a conception which was first suggested by Walter Pater and recently by Huizinga, viz. the idea of the overlapping and even fusion of different spheres of culture.

The second essay is by Prof. H a n s L i e b e s c h ü t z, author of a book on Frederick II. and England. He examines the "Sinn des Wissens bei Roger Bacon". The fate which has attended Bacon's memory in the history of philosophy is a chain of misunderstandings varying from a hyperbolic enthusiasm in the past century to a radical rejection of the claim of his originality in Dr. Little's essay (1928). Bacon is no longer regarded as a modern mind fighting as a solitary champion and preparing the way for the future, but as a typically medieval scholar who had followed the doctrines of the preceding age. After giving a short description of his life, Prof. Liebeschütz attempts to analyse his theory of knowledge, and succeeds in throwing many interesting sidelights upon his character. In his essay, it is true, Bacon appears as a fighter against his age, his standpoint, however, is not that of a pioneer of the coming generation, but merely that of an opponent of scholasticism. According to Bacon, truth can be found neither through science nor through reason only, for it is something transnatural and transrational. Bacon believes in revelation and a mysticism which he found in the Greek, Arabian and Jewish speculations of his time. Knowledge is a gift of God's mercy, not a medium for power. The author's study is based to a great extent on the excellent book of Carton (1924), though the interpretation of the same facts is different. While the French scholar sees in Bacon's conception of knowledge the mental preparation of the millennium, Prof. Liebeschütz thinks his doctrine a synthesis of classic idealism and medieval empiricism. It is difficult to say if he is right, at any rate his argument needs a closer investigation.

Then follows an essay on "Erasmus in England" by Professor I. A. K. T h o m s o n, who some years ago wrote a book on "Irony". The title of his last study is somewhat misleading, the writer being not so much concerned with Erasmus' stay in England as with an analysis of his temperament. It is the merit of Erasmus to have brought back irony into literature — together

with Thomas Morus, with whom he was intimately connected in his work. Both were led to this conception of life by a close study of the Greek writers, especially of Lucian. Mr. Thomson elaborates this idea in a very interesting essay.

Prof. Schirmer, whose books belong to the best inquiries into the literary relations between the Ancients and England, has found a congenial subject in his essay on "Chaucer, Shakespeare und die Antike". There exists already a good book on the indebtedness of Chaucer to the chief Latin poets by Dr. Shannon ("Chaucer and the Roman Poets", 1928), who on the strength of a careful scrutiny of the text concludes that Ovid had a great influence on the English poet. But Shannon's way of arguing is often very tiresome, whereas Prof. Schirmer has written a very fascinating essay, whose chief result is the thesis that Chaucer borrowed from Virgil and Ovid to make his representation of life more realistic and true to nature. This statement which is illustrated by many examples is of great importance, for it shows in how many respects Chaucer is a modern spirit. Things are different with regard to Shakespeare. He preferred the heroic element in ancient literature (cf. Plutarch), though it is very remarkable that the more he was touched by the problems of life and death the less he needed the Roman pattern. The reader will fully appreciate Prof. Schirmer's interpretation of Shakespeare.

The next essay, which deals with English stage scenery (Oskar Fischel, *Inigo Jones und der Theaterstil der Renaissance*), is a scholarly discussion of several problems of style in the beginning of the baroque age. — E. Cassirer reprints an article from his book on the Cambridge Platonists ("Shaftesbury und die Renaissance des Platonismus in England") showing the stages in the development of Platonism from the Renaissance to the revival of classical culture in the 18th century. His discussions of the comic spirit as the basic element of the humanistic mind deserve our notice.

Eighteenth-century problems are furthermore discussed by Dr. Edgar Wind in his essay "Humanitätsidee und Heroisiertes Porträt in der englischen Kultur des 18. Jahrhunderts". In this study art is seen under the aspect of the philosophy of the time. The difference between Reynolds and Gainsborough with regard to their artistic aims is a reflexion of the philosophic conflicts between Hume and his many adversaries. Hume's philosophy of human nature is that of a thorough-going sceptic. His refutation of all heroism is characteristic. I doubt, however, whether his philosophy really is as much akin to that of the Stoa as the writer of the article supposes. Hume's tolerance and evenness of mind often seem to be a mere appeal to logic. On the other hand, it is true that he had to defend his position against many critics such as James Beattie, Burke or Goldsmith, who stood for enthusiasm and heroism. It is of particular interest to observe the same contrast in the artistic aims of Reynolds and Gainsborough. While the former prefers the grand style, the pictures of the latter represent the simple style. These aesthetic standards, illustrated by a great many examples, are very striking and make Dr. Wind's article an interesting study.

In his essay "Classicism and Romanticism in the Poetry of Walter Savage Landor" Prof. E. de Selincourt attempts to put this neglected romantic poet in the line of literary tradition. He is regarded as a classic in a romantic age. This thesis is developed with great enthusiasm and genuine insight into literary criticism. Especially the interpretation of the "Hellenics" and the "Epigrams" is excellent.

The last essay in the book is on "The Position and Function of Classical Studies in Modern English Education" by Sir Richard W. Livingstone. It contains more than the title implies. We are accustomed to look upon the Victorian age as a period of Hebraism and Philistinism. Nevertheless there existed an uninterrupted classical tradition in public life. In the universities and schools, it is true, the teaching of the classical languages grew more and more formal till the great reform work which began with the Royal Commission of 1862 gave a new impetus to the development. The writer is rather optimistic with regard to the present, as he believes there is a new hellenistic spirit in the study of the Ancients. Thanks to the endeavours of men of genius such as Gilbert Murray the classical languages have indeed become again *literae humaniores*. Sir Richard's essay is inspired by a high idealism, it professes a sincere belief in the value of humanistic studies which, as everyone must acknowledge, have created the Public School spirit. But we must not forget that the old classical tradition is nowadays confined to a small group of people, as Cyril Norwood pointed out in his book "The English Tradition of Education". Since the abolition of compulsory Greek those who can teach the Classics in the humanistic sense have become rare. I doubt furthermore "that our generation can understand Hellenism better than any preceding age, because our civilisation, like Greek civilisation, rests on an intellectual basis". On the contrary, it seems to me that western civilisation of to-day is further away from the classical spirit than we are apt to think. Our philosophy of life is not one of intellect but of will, which makes humanism unacceptable to most people.

To sum up: the book is a detailed discussion of actual problems by men who are experts in their literary departments. Its editor, Prof. Wolff of the University of Hamburg, must be given unqualified praise. We get a deep insight into the creative spirit of English literary life which cannot be isolated from general culture. As long as a systematic work on the classical influence on English literature is lacking, essays such as these are a very good help.

Breslau.

P. MEISSNER.

*Die Platonische Renaissance in England und die Schule von Cambridge.* Von ERNEST CASSIRER. Leipzig, Teubner, 1932. Pp. VIII—143. Rm. 7. (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg, XXIV).

*Das Erbe Platons in England bis zur Bildung Lylys. Stufen einer Spiegelung.* Von FRIEDRICH DANNENBERG. Berlin, Junker und Dünhaupt Verlag, 1932. Pp. XIV—246. Rm. 12. (Neue Forschung, Arbeiten zur Geistesgeschichte der Germanischen und Romanischen Völker, 13).

The last few years have seen a remarkable awakening of interest in the Platonic influence in England during the Renaissance. We have had occasion to notice in these pages ("English Studies", XIV, 2, April 1932) the *Philosophical Poems* of Henry More edited by G. Bullough (Manchester University Press, 1931); now it is the turn of the general survey of



F. Dannenberg and of Prof. Cassirer's excellent monograph. Cassirer's study comes first in importance, since it is the first to define the place, in the development of European thought, of the secluded and, at first sight, secondary philosophical movement which goes by the name of the Cambridge School. Cassirer omits all biographical information and confines himself to the systematic study of ideas; he shows, from a new angle, that the Cambridge School affords more than the interest of a literary curiosity. The religious current which from the Deventer group by way of Nicolaus Cusanus passed into Italy, into the Platonic Academy of Florence, thence came back to England and gave rise to the Cambridge School. But whereas in Italy, chiefly with Lorenzo Valla, the Platonic movement antagonized Christian ethics, it followed the opposite course in England, where it aimed at a syncretism on a rationalist foundation. "Religion itself" — wrote one of the Cambridge thinkers, Whichcote, — "is always the same; but things about religion are not always the same. The state of religion lies in a good mind and a good life, all else is about religion; and men must not put the instrumental part of religion for the state of religion." This is an echo of Cusanus' saying (in *De pace fidei*): "*Una est religio in rituum varietate*". The essence of religion is made to consist in a moral habit. Using the Platonic idea of apriority as a lever, the Cambridge philosophers on the one hand aimed at shaking the foundations of Baconian empiricism, on the other at undermining the principles of the orthodox church as well as of the various sects. Their insistence on the indispensability of reason is of paramount importance: "Reason is not a shallow thing: it is the first participation from God; therefore, he that observes reason, observes God." — "To go against reason is to go against God": these aphorisms of Whichcote anticipate Leibnitz.

A first serious handicap for the Cambridge School was their still scholastic frame of mind. They tried to oppose to the primacy of action (*operatio*) proclaimed by empirical philosophy, the primacy of contemplation, ethico-religious experience to scientific induction, but as soon as they endeavoured to carry the war into the actual territory of the empiricists, that of naturalist research, they showed their weakness and lack of preparation in accepting fantastic notions side by side with scientific ones, so as to afford the paradoxical spectacle of leaving reason the undisputed sway of the religious field, while forgetting it in the field where it would have been most in keeping, that of science. They fought the mechanist conception on the ground of the *ὑστερον πρότερον* which it seemed to argue; to evolution they opposed emanation, and denied the upward in favour of the downward direction; but in so doing they implicitly imperilled the operative power of the soul and pinned this latter to a state of rigid immutability. The road which led to the over-coming of Descartes' position went through mathematics, not away from it. Leibnitz was not less of a metaphysical spiritualist than the Cambridge thinkers, but differed from them in laying the foundations of spiritualism in a logical and mathematical idealism, rather than in religious axioms. So that a double line of Platonic influence can be traced through the Renaissance; one on Ficinus, Pico, Cudworth and More, another on Kepier, Galilei and Leibnitz: there it is chiefly the Platonic theory of Eros and Beauty which comes under consideration; here, the theory of knowledge; on the one side *Symposium*, *Phaidros*, *Timaeus*, on the other *Menon*, *Theaetetus* and *Sophistes*.

The speculations of the Cambridge School were preserved thanks to Shaftesbury, who continued the campaign it had started against Puritan

sectarianism ("*Non sum Christianus alicujus nominis*," wrote Whichcote), and against ethical nominalism. Shaftesbury's criticism of the notion of a social compact has its origin in the tenets of the Cambridge School; there originates also his esthetic theory of disinterested pleasure. Cassirer shows that the starting point of the aesthetic ideas which were in full swing in XVIIIth century England is to be found in Platonism rather than in psychological empiricism, to which they had been traced hitherto. Through Shaftesbury, therefore, the Cambridge school forms a stage on the road that leads from Italian humanism to the humanism of the XVIIIth century.

While the greater portion of Cassirer's study concerns the history of philosophy, a number of pages are of literary interest, such as the long *excursus* on humour in the English literature of the Renaissance, chiefly in Shakespeare; humour is considered here as the necessary antecedent of the progress which took place in æsthetic theory thanks to Shaftesbury.

Literature and history of culture rather than philosophy, are in the foreground in Dannenberg's thesis which was awarded an annual prize by the Göttingen Faculty of Philosophy. Although direct allusions to Plato are rare in Lyly, Dannenberg sees his work as the outcome of a Platonic movement, and therefore gives a survey of the Platonic influence in England, with special regard to the circles where Lyly was educated. Colet, Starkey, Eliot, Ascham, are thus successively studied with that purpose; the author has a good command of the vast subject, although he seldom advances original views, and draws extensively on Schröder's, Feuillerat's, Einstein's researches. Acute remarks are, however, not lacking, as when the difference is sketched between the idea of the Italian *cortegiano* and that of the English *Gentleman*, who already foreshadows the figure of the civil servant, or when the origins of the modern novel are discussed: these and such-like remarks give a personal touch to the ample dissertation. On the origin of euphuism Dannenberg has little to say; he fails to take into proper account Miss Jeffery's conclusions (in *John Lyly and the Italian Renaissance*, Paris, 1929<sup>1</sup>), which drew attention to Boccaccio as a likelier model than Guevara, who still looms large with Dannenberg. Second-hand acquaintance with the sources is betrayed only exceptionally, as for instance on page 139, where Della Casa's volume is quoted as *Galatea* instead of *Galateo*.

Firenze.

MARIO PRAZ.

---

*The Gold-Headed Cane.* By WILLIAM MACMICHAEL, M. D. Edited with explanatory and illustrative notes and an essay on William Macmichael, M. D., his life, his works, and his editors by HERBERT SPENSER ROBINSON. XXXI + 223 pp. Froben Press, Inc. New York. 1932. \$ 3.50.

In the eighteenth century, and earlier, a physician did not appear in public without his walking-stick and full-bottomed wig. In 1827 when this custom

---

<sup>1</sup> See E. S. XII (1930), pp. 40-41. — Ed.

was dying out Dr. Macmichael had the good idea of writing down and publishing the history and adventures of one such professional cane on whose golden head were engraven the armorial designs of its five successive owners. They were the doctors Radcliffe, Mead, Askew, William Pitcairn, and Baillie, all having enjoyed the privileges of a *praxis aurea*, and belonging to the eminent scientists of their time.

The omnipresence of the cane enabled it to hear the consultations, the disputations, and the anecdotes relating to a period which partly covered Holland's golden age. Mead maintained a constant correspondence with Boerhaave; Askew had studied at the university of Leyden; William Pitcairn too; and the cane heard from Baillie:

From among the various authors ... it is impossible not to select the name of Boerhaave, superior perhaps in learning and information, and possessing more judgment than any of them. He has been compared to Galen, being endowed with the same extensive range of knowledge on all topics, directly or indirectly connected with medicine, the same dexterity in availing himself of the information of his predecessors or contemporaries, and the same felicity in moulding these separate materials into one consistent and harmonious whole. By his great assiduity, his acquaintance with chemistry and botany, in short with every department connected with medicine, he raised the University of Leyden, his native town, to the rank of the first medical school in Europe.<sup>1</sup> (p. 129/30)

In science, as a rule, great discoveries do not pay. The millionaire Boerhaave was not a great discoverer, but William Harvey was who

could never forget, after the publication, at Frankfort, in 1628, of his doctrine of the circulation of the blood, that such was the general prejudice against him as an innovator, that his practice as a physician considerably declined. (p. 62)

Fortunately, the public was more grateful for Jenner's method of prevailing over the disastrous ravages of the small-pox.

In Molière's and Rattcliffe's time the *ars curandi* (or "tuandi") consisted in an almost general

Clysterium donare,  
Postea seignare,  
Ensuita purgare,  
Reseignare, repurgare, et reclysterizare.

Here is part of the report of the first consultation at which the cane was present; it happened in the autumn of 1689 at Kensington House:

On entering the sick chamber, which was a small cabinet in the south-east angle of the building, called the Writing Closet, a person of a grave and solemn aspect, apparently about forty years of age, of a thin and weak body, brown hair, and of middle stature, was seen sitting in an arm-chair, and breathing with great difficulty. The naturally serious character of the King (for it was His Majesty William the Third) was rendered more melancholy by the distressing symptoms of an asthma, the consequence of the dregs of the small-pox, that had fallen on his lungs. In the absence of the fit, and at other times, his sparkling eyes, large and elevated forehead, and aquiline nose, gave a dignity to his countenance, which, though usually grave and phlegmatic, was said in the

<sup>1</sup> ... l'affluence des étudiants était telle à Leyde, qu'on fut obligé d'abattre les remparts de la ville pour y bâtir des maisons; ... Ch. Daremberg, *Histoire des Sciences Médicales*, 1870, p. 889.



day of battle to be susceptible of the most animated expression. "Doctor", said the King, "Bentinck and Zulestein have been urgent with me that I should again send for you; and though I have great confidence in my two body-physicians here, yet I have heard so much of your great skill, that I desire you will confer with Bidloo and Laurence, whether some other plan might not be adopted. They have plied me so much with aperitives to open my stomach, that I am greatly reduced; my condition is, I think, hazardous, unless you try other measures. (p. 10)

Dr. Ratcliffe, the first owner of the cane, and the physician who had been sent for, ordered a less purgative method of diverting "the dregs of the small-pox" with the happy result that, a few months afterwards, the King was able to fight the battle of the Boyne, and to defeat James II.

One day, Dr. Freind was committed to the tower. Dr. Mead promised his aid.

... when Sir Robert Walpole, the minister of the day, sent to consult Mead on account of an indisposition, he availed himself of the occasion to plead the cause of the captive. He urged, that though the warmth and freedom of Freind might have betrayed him into some intemperate observations, yet no one could doubt his patriotic feelings and loyalty; that his public services had been great, for he had attended the Earl of Peterborough in his Spanish expedition as an army physician, and had also accompanied in the same capacity the Duke of Ormond into Flanders; that he deserved well of science, for he had done so much to call the attention of the world to the new and sound principles of the Newtonian philosophy; and was besides a man of excellent parts, and thorough scholar, and one whom all acknowledged to be very able in his profession: and, finally, the Doctor refused to prescribe for the Minister unless the prisoner was set at liberty. He was almost immediately relieved from prison, ... (p. 42/3)

The famous cane was more interested in the doings of the doctors than in their theories. To conclude, we mention a last instance. Martin van Butchall, as the editor's note teaches us, had studied under John Hunter; he was a dentist, truss-maker, and specialist in the treatment of fistula. He used to appear in public places on a white pony which, when his fancy moved him, he painted purple, or purple and black. When his wife died at the age of forty he had the corpse prepared, he preserved it as a mummy, and kept it in the parlour, showing it to friends and visitors. Sir George Baker, Physician to Their Majesties, provided a Latin poem for the occasion: *In reliquias Mariæ Vanbutchel, novo miraculo conservatas, et a marito suo superstite, cultu quotidiano adoratas*. Here are the last lines:

O! fortunatum hominem et invidendum  
Cui peculiare hoc, et proprium contingit  
Apud se habere fæminam  
Non variam, non mutabilem  
Et egregie taciturnam!

(p. 118)

This sixth edition of *The Gold-Headed Cane* is an American one prepared by Professor Robinson (Bucknell University) who has added a life of William Macmichael, and annotated the text profusely, learnedly, and most admirably.

The Hague.

B. A. P. VAN DAM.

*The Letters of Sir Walter Scott 1815—1817.* Edited by H. J. C. GRIERSON. 1933. Centenary Edition. Constable, London. 18 sh.

This new volume, the fourth, of Scott's Letters contains about 265 letters which have never been printed before, and of the 50 which have, 20 are printed here correctly for the first time. For example, only 41 are in Lockhart and of his treatment of them, a specimen, though an extreme specimen, is the famous Black Hussar letter, which Scott wrote when Blackwood mildly — and quite rightly — hinted that the end of *The Black Dwarf* might be improved. The true version, now printed for the first time, begins: "My respects to the Booksellers & I belong to the Death-head Hussars of literature who neither take nor give criticism..... I never heard of such impudence in my life, etc." (p. 276). Lockhart's version, "based I know not on what," says Prof. Grierson, runs: — "I have received Blackwood's impudent proposal. G— d— his soul! Tell him and his coadjutor that I belong to the Black Hussars of Literature, who neither give nor receive criticism. I'll be cursed but this is the most impudent proposal that ever was made. W. S." (*Life*, chap. 37). Lockhart had evidently not yet, after nineteen years, outgrown the swash-buckler style which he and Christopher North had used to give *Blackwood's Magazine* notoriety!

The years covered by this volume are those chiefly associated with the writing of *Guy Mannering*, *The Antiquary*, *Old Mortality*, and *Roy Roy*, but as always, next to nothing appears of them in Scott's letters. In a letter to Terry the actor he shows his glee at the picture — or caricature, as many thought it — of the Covenanters in *Old Mortality*. "The subject of the second tale lies among the old Scottish Cameronians — nay, I'll tickle ye off a Covenanter as readily as old Jack could do a young Prince; and a rare fellow he is, when brought forth in his true colours" (p. 288). When Lady Abercorn presses him about the authorship of the book, he evades her, but betrays, perhaps deliberately, a surprising knowledge of the lives of the leading historical characters in it. In a letter of 18th April, 1816, (p. 216) occurs the well-known reference to Dandie Dinmont. As regards *Rob Roy*, the sole signs of it apart from the business details arranged with Constable, are two sentences answering (very unsatisfactorily) James Ballantyne's just criticism of the English scenes as inferior to the Scotch (pp. 518, 533). By contrast there is a great deal about the building and planting of Abbotsford, at this stage usually called "the cottage," and it is amazing what an immense amount of paper and time, chiefly in his letters to Terry, he is willing to spend on his darling project, and what a number of people, often the merest acquaintances, he contrives to interest and use in obtaining plans, stained glass for windows, coats of arms, mural decorations, antiquities, and the like. Here and there, but much too seldom for those of us who are interested in the man rather than the writer, there are little personal pictures. "I saunter about," he tells Lady Abercorn in November, 1816 (p. 308), "from nine in the morning till five at night with a plaid about my shoulders and an immensely large bloodhound at my heels and stick in sprigs which are to become trees when I shall have no eyes to look at them. Somebody will look at them however though I question if they will have the same pleasure in gazing on the full-grown oaks that I have in nursing the saplings." And in March 1817 (p. 413), he tells Morritt, with his characteristic humour, of the first attack of the ailment which troubled him

seriously for several years at this period. "I hasten to acquaint you that I am in the land of life and thriving though I have had a light shake and still feel the consequence of the medical treatment. I have been plagued all through this winter with cramps in the stomach which I endured as a man of mould might and endeavoured to combat them by drinking scalding water and so forth..... On the 5th I had a most violent attack which broke up a small party at my house and sent me to bed roaring like a bullcalf. All sorts of remedies were applied as in the case of Gil Blas' pretended colic but such was the pain of the real disorder that it out-devild the doctors hollow. Even heated salt which was applied in such a state that it burned my shirt to rags I hardly felt when applied to my stomach..... So I had a comfortless time of it for about a week. Even yet I by no means feel as the copy book hath it

The lion bold which the lamb doth hold.

On the contrary I am as weak as water..... I take enough of exercise and enough of rest. But unluckily they are like a Lapland year divided as one night and one day. In the vacation I never sit down. In the Session time I seldom rise up."

There is a long and highly interesting description of Waterloo written on the spot two months after the battle for the Duke of Buccleuch (p. 78), and in two letters to Joanna Baillie (pp. 202, 522—3), an interesting side-light is thrown on the Byron separation and Lady Byron, who visited the Scotts in 1817. Scott found her charming, but suspected a "certain decision of character which perhaps is more graceful in adversity than it might have at all times been in prosperity." Laidlaw bluntly called it "obstinacy."

The editorial work of the volume is of course admirable. In particular, the footnotes are never unnecessary or too long, and they contrive, for all their terseness, to remain human, even humorous sometimes.

Groningen.

J. A. FALCONER.

### Brief Mention.

*Vollständiges Wörterbuch zur sog. Caedmonschen Genesis.* Von THEODOR BRAASCH (Anglistische Forschungen hrsg. von Dr. Johannes Hoops, Heft 76), VII + 157 p. Heidelberg: Winter. 1933. RM. 10.

One could not say that the need for such a dictionary was a pressing one. For, as Dr. Braasch himself says, Grein's *Sprachschatz* contains a great many references to the poem; but if one agrees with the compiler that "jede lexicographische Arbeit auf dem Gebiete des Altenglischen, wofern sie nur nach Möglichkeit genau und methodisch ausgeführt ist, durch ihre Veröffentlichung wohl nicht ohne Nutzen für die Anglistik bleiben dürfte", then this work is to be recognized as a valuable addition to the glossaries that we already possess in the field of Germanic lexicography.

Dr. Braasch has aimed at completeness and so far as we have been able to test it, his dictionary covers the whole vocabulary of Genesis A and B, with exhaustive references and with full quotations (with the exception of grammatical words) wherever useful, and sound definitions.

The author has largely taken into account the corrections and readings proposed by Holthausen, Klaeber, Grein-Wülcker and others but he always gives the text of the MS., and cross-references mark the alternate readings.

Misprints are rare (P. VII read Cosijn for Cosjin). Occasionally a few *b*'s have been printed as *p*'s (e.g. *pisse* under *āgend-frēa*, *pæt* under *lið*) but this is too obvious to be of any inconvenience. Dr. Braasch's work is a reliable piece of lexicography. — F. M.



*The Approach to Shakespeare.* By J. W. MACKAIL. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1930. 144 pp. 6 sh.

The title of this book seems to hold a promise, especially for the conscientious teacher of literature, whose mind is naturally exercised about several questions, such as: the pre-Shakespearean drama; the Renaissance and Shakespeare etc. None of these is even as much as hinted at, for Shakespeare alone is the subject. Unfortunately neither the prospective student nor the young teacher will find much in the book as it is, to serve him as a guide. The first chapter insists — no less than seven times — on reading "largely, deeply, freely, incessantly". The next section: 'The Shakespeare-Canon and the Preludes', repeats some useful but by no means novel remarks about the Canon with its division into four seven-year periods, and contains a passage about Marlowe's influence, assumed but not proved, and a good discussion of *Romeo and Juliet*. In 'The Decade of the Comedies' we are pleased to note a suggestive characterization of the Histories. But the elaborate treatment of irrelevant details of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* does not seem to serve the purpose for which this little book was written; the short note on the opening of *Twelfth Night* is more to the point; the remarks at the end on "the many ways of approach" entirely superfluous. In 'The Decade of the Tragedies' it is stated that "it is impossible to say anything that has not been said already". Then why devote twenty-three pages to it, one is inclined to ask. And why, in a book of this nature, should Albany in *King Lear* be presented as the pivot of the play, because "he is the only sane and balanced character and with a few simple words takes up the burden of the Kingdom"? Could not, by the same token, Fortinbras be called the pivot of *Hamlet* and Malcolm of *Macbeth*? On the side of psychological valuations this chapter must fall short of any expectations, however mild.

The section on *The Tempest* shows a duality which cannot escape any intelligent beginner. Here the author interprets Milan as Stratford and "this young couple" as the new generation. But the part of "mere pageantry" is with equal arbitrariness accorded to Ariel and Caliban.

The apparent promise of the title is not fulfilled, neither is the dithyrambic style with its forced metaphors an attraction. — W. A. O.

---

*Elizabethan Plays*, written by Shakespeare's Friends, Colleagues, Rivals, and Successors. Edited, with new Texts based on the original folios, quartos, and octavos by HAZELTON SPENCER. vii + 1173 pp. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. M.CM.XXXIII. Price \$ 4.00.

An omnibus volume containing twenty-eight plays by Elizabethan dramatists, edited with scholarly care and precision, printed in clear type on good paper, and tastefully bound and otherwise got-up — surely, here is an astonishing four dollars' worth. Marlowe is represented by four plays, Lyly, Greene and Kyd by one each, Ben Jonson by four, Chapman, Marston and Thomas Heywood by one play each, Dekker by three, Beaumont and Fletcher by four, Webster, Middleton, Massinger, Ford and Shirley by one play each, not to mention *Eastward Ho* and *The Changeling*, the products of collaboration between Chapman-Jonson-Marston, and Middleton-Rowley respectively. The plays are supplemented by notes where necessary, and prefaced by brief introductions giving the main facts as to origins, textual history and standard editions. The volume contains a portrait of Ben Jonson facing the title-page, and facsimiles of the title-pages of original editions of all the plays included. Strongly recommended. — Z.

---

## Bibliography.

[The German items have been contributed by Dr. EGON MÜHLBACH,  
Deputy Librarian of the University of Leipzig.]

### POETRY, FICTION, DRAMA.

*The Poems and Fables of Robert Henryson*, Schoolmaster of Dunfermline. Edited from the Earliest Manuscripts and Printed Texts by H. HARVEY WOOD. 9 × 6, xliii. + 304 pp. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. 12 s. 6 d. n.

*Richard Stanyhurst's Aeneis.* By D. VAN DER HAAR. 200 pp. Amsterdam, H. J. Paris, 1933. Diss. Amsterdam.

*The Oxford Book of Sixteenth Century Verse.* Chosen by E. K. CHAMBERS.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , xiv. + 906 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 8s. 6d. n. [A review will appear.]

*The Works of Edmund Spenser.* A Variorum Edition. Edited by E. GREENLAW, C. G. OSGOOD and F. M. PADELFORD. *The Faerie Queene.* Book One. F. M. PADELFORD, Special Editor. XII + 556 pp. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1932. \$ 6.—. [A review will appear.]

*Shakespeare's Sonnetten.* Vertaald door J. DECROOS. 113 pp. Kortrijk, Steenlandt, 1932. Prijs? [See Review, Oct. 1933.]

*Shakespeare's Sonnetten.* Vertaald door ALBERT VERWEY. 176 pp. Santpoort: Mees. 1933. Ing. f 3.75, geb. f 4.90. [A review will appear.]

*Poly-Olbion.* By MICHAEL DRAYTON. Being the Fourth Volume of his Works. Edited by J. WILLIAM HEBEL.  $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ , xvi. + xv. + 589 pp. Oxford: Blackwell. £7 17s. 6d. n. set of Five Volumes. [A review will appear.]

*A Poetical Rhapsody, 1602—1621.* Edited by HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS. Vol. II.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , 331 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. London: Milford. 24s. 6d. n.

*The Poems of John Donne.* Edited by H. J. C. GRIERSON.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , lvi. + 404 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 3s. 6d. n.

*The Works of John Milton.* Vol. VII. vii. + 587 pp. Vol. X., ix. + 382 pp.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ . New York: Columbia University Press. London: Milford. £32 n. the set of 18 volumes.

*John Milton's Epitaphium Damonis.* Printed from the First Edition. With a New Translation by WALTER W. SKEAT. In Memory of Israel Gollancz.  $9 \times 7$ , 21 pp. Cambridge University Press. 2s. 6d. n.

*A Collection of English Poems, 1660—1800.* Selected and Edited by RONALD S. CRANE.  $9\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , xxiv. + 1170 pp. Harper. 15s. n.

*The Pepys Ballads.* Edited by HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS. Vol. VIII. Indexes.  $9 \times 6$ , 243 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. London: Milford. 21s. 6d. n.

*The Songs of John Dryden.* Edited by CYRUS LAWRENCE DAY.  $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ , xvi.  $\times$  199 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. London: Milford. 14s. n.

*An Anthology of Augustan Poetry 1700-1751.* Compiled and edited by F. T. WOOD. 1xix + 323 pp. London, Macmillan, 1931. 7/6 net. [See Review, June 1933.]

*The Works of Thomas Purney.* Edited by H. O. WHITE. (The Percy Reprints, XII.) XXXIV + 111 pp. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1933. 5/— net. [A review will appear.]

*Poems of Charles Churchill.* Edited by JAMES LAVER. In two Volumes.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , Vol. I., 1. + 210 pp.; Vol. II., pp. 211-466. (King's Printers' Edition.) Eyre and Spottiswoode. 63s. n.

*An Elegy: Written in a Country Churchyard.* By THOMAS GRAY. The Three Manuscripts.  $12 \times 9\frac{1}{4}$ , xiii. + 39 pp. Edward Walters and Geoffrey Miller (96, Oppidans Road, Primrose Hill, N.W. 3). 25s. n.

*Ancient Songs Chiefly on Moorish Subjects.* Translated from the Spanish by THOMAS PERCY. With a Preface by DAVID NICHOL SMITH.  $11\frac{1}{2} \times 9$ , xviii. + 56 pp. and plates. Oxford University Press. London: Milford. 42s. n.

*Visions of the Daughters of Albion.* By WILLIAM BLAKE. Reproduced in Facsimile from an original copy of the work printed and illuminated by the author in 1793, now in the British Museum. With a Note by JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY.  $10 \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ , Dent. 15s.

*The Prelude or Growth of a Poet's Mind.* By WILLIAM WORDSWORTH. (Text of 1805.) Edited from the Manuscripts with Introduction and Notes by ERNEST DE SELINCOURT.  $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5$ , xxxix. + 327 pp. (Oxford Editions of Standard Authors.) Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 3s. 6d. n.

*New Love-Poems.* By SIR WALTER SCOTT. Discovered in the Narrative of an Unknown Love Episode with Jessie — of Kelso. Edited by DAVIDSON COOK.  $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , viii. + 40 pp. Oxford: Blackwell. 5s. n.

*The Heart of Scott's Poetry.* Selected by JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , xxxi. + 245 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 6s. n.



*Fugitive Pieces.* By GEORGE GORDON NOËL BYRON. Reproduced from the First Edition. With a Bibliographical Note by MARCEL KESSEL.  $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 66 pp. For the Facsimile Text Society. New York: Columbia University Press. London: Milford. 13s. 6d. n.

*The Poems of Emily Dickinson.* Edited by MARTHA DICKINSON BIANCHI and ALFRED LEETE HAMPSON.  $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , 401 pp. (Definitive Complete Edition.) Martin Secker, 15s. n.

*An Anthology of Modern Verse.* Chosen by A. METHUEN. With an Introduction by ROBERT LYND.  $7 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ , xlv. + 254 pp. Methuen. 6s. n.

*Shakespeare to Hardy.* An Anthology of English Lyrics. Chosen by A. METHUEN. With an Introduction by ROBERT LYND. Fifth Edition.  $7 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ , liii. + 547 pp. Methuen. 6s. n.

*The Best Poems of 1933.* Selected by THOMAS MOULT and Decorated by ELIZABETH MONTGOMERY.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 128 pp. Jonathan Cape. 6s. n.

*The Noble and Joyous Boke entytled le Morte Darthur.* Notwithstandyng it treateth of the Byrth, Lyf and Actes of the sayd Kynge Arthur: of his Noble Knyghtes of the Rounde Table, theyr Merveyllous Enquestes and Adventures. Thachyevynge of the Sanc-Greall and in the ende the Dolorous Deth: and departynge out of this Worlde of them al. Whyche boke was reduced in to Englysshe by the well dysposyd knyghte SYR THOMAS MALORY. In two volumes.  $10\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ , Vol. I. xxviii. + 316 pp. Oxford: Blackwell. £ 9 9s. on Half Leather, £ 9 15s. on Full Leather, the two volumes.

*Volume the First.* By JANE AUSTEN. Now first printed from the Manuscript in the Bodleian Library.  $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5$ , ix + 140 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 5s. n.

*The Lovely Lady.* By D. H. LAWRENCE.  $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 246 pp. Martin Secker. 7s. 6d. n.

*Ann Vickers.* By SINCLAIR LEWIS.  $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 460 pp. Jonathan Cape, 7s. 6d. n.

*The Bulpington of Blup.* Adventures, Poses, Stresses, Conflicts, and Disaster in a Contemporary Brain. By H. G. WELLS.  $8 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 408 pp. Hutchinson. 8s. 6d. n.

*Vanessa.* By HUGH WALPOLE.  $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , xii. + 851 pp. Macmillan. 10s. 6d. n.

*Over the River.* By JOHN GALSWORTHY.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ , 322 pp. Heinemann. 7s. 6d. n.

*The Oxford Book of American Prose.* Chosen and Edited by MARK VAN DOREN.  $7\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , xxii. + 662 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 12s. 6d. n.

*Mary of Nimmegen.* A Facsimile Reproduction of the Copy of the English Version in the Huntington Library. With an Introduction by HARRY MORGAN AYRES and ADRIAAN JACOB BARNOUW.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ . (Huntington Library Publications.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. London: Milford. 13s. n. [A review will appear.]

*A Looking-Glass for London and England.* By THOMAS LODGE and ROBERT GREENE. 1594.  $8\frac{1}{4} \times 7$ . (The Malone Society Reprints.) Malone Society.

*The Works of Shakespeare.* The Text of the First Folio with Quarto variants and a selection of modern readings. Edited by HERBERT FARJEON. Quartos, Pericles, Prince of Tyre, The Merry Wives of Windsor, The Chronicle Historie of Henry the Fifth, The First Part of the Contention (Henry VI., Part. II.), The True Tragedie (Henry VI., Part III.), Romeo and Juliet, Hamlet.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , 517 pp. Nonesuch Press. 72s. 6d. n.

*Elizabethan Plays,* written by Shakespeare's Friends, Colleagues, Rivals, and Successors. Edited, with new Texts based on the original folios, quartos, and octavos by HAZELTON SPENCER. vii + 1173 pp. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. M.CM. XXXIII. Price \$ 4.00. [See Brief Mention.]

*The Bondman:* An Antient Storie by PHILIP MASSINGER. Edited from the First Quarto with Introduction and Notes by BENJAMIN TOWNLEY SPENCER.  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , viii. + 266 pp. For the University of Cincinnati. Princeton: Princeton University Press. London: Milford, 18s. n.

*The Unnatural Combat.* By PHILIP MASSINGER. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by ROBERT STOCKDALE TELFER.  $10 \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , 193 pp. (Princeton Studies in English, 7.) Princeton: University Press. London: Milford. 14s. 6d. n.

NATHANIEL LEE, *Constantine The Great.* Kritisch herausgegeben und mit einer Einleitung versehen von W. HÄFELE. (Engl. Textbibliothek, herausg. von J. Hoops, 20.) 166 pp. Heidelberg, Winter, 1933. RM. 5.50. [A review will appear.]

*The Malvern Festival Plays, MCMXXXIII.* Arranged for Production by H. K. AYLIFF. With an Introduction by HUGH WALPOLE and Preface by SIR BARRY JACKSON.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ , viii. + 343 pp. Heath Cranton. 5s. n.



## HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM.

*The Growth of Literature.* By H. MUNRO CHADWICK. Volume I. *The Ancient Literatures of Europe.* 9½ × 6½, xx. + 672 pp. Cambridge University Press. 30 s. n.

*Der Germanische Volksglaube von den Toten und Dämonen im Berg und ihrer Beschwichtigung. Die Spuren in England.* Von W. JORDANS. (Bonner Studien zur englischen Philologie, xvii.) 71 pp. Bonn. Hanstein, 1933. Mk. 3.60. [See Review, June 1933.]

*Englische und nordgermanische Heldensage.* Von H. SCHNEIDER. Kl. 8°. pp. 144. Berlin: de Gruyter. 1933 = Sammlung Götschen 1064. RM. 1.62.

*Beowulfstudien.* Von J. HOOPS. (Anglistische Forschungen, 74.) viii + 140 pp. Heidelberg, Winter, 1932. RM. 7.50. [See Review, June 1933.]

*Kommentar zum Beowulf.* Von J. HOOPS. x + 333 pp. Heidelberg, Winter, 1932. Geh. 8 M., geb. 10 M. [See Review, Aug. 1933.]

*Cynewulf and His Poetry.* By KENNETH SISAM. Sir Israel Gollancz Memorial Lecture, British Academy, 1932. 10¼ × 6¾, 31 pp. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy. Volume XVIII.) Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 1933. 2s. n.

*Anglo-Saxon Influence on Western Christendom, 600—800.* By S. J. CRAWFORD. 109 pp. Oxford University Press. 1933. 5/- net.

*Pioneers of English Learning.* By THOMAS ALLISON. 8¾ × 5¾, xx. + 109 pp. Oxford: Blackwell, 5s. n.

*History of the Vulgate in England from Alcuin to Roger Bacon.* Being an Inquiry into the Text of some English Manuscripts of the Vulgate Gospels. By H. H. GLUNZ. xx + 383 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1933. 18/- net. [A review will appear.]

*England und die Antike.* Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg, herausgegeben von F. SAXL. ix. Band. Vorträge 1930—1931. Mit 30 Lichtdrucktafeln. xii + 304 pp. Leipzig, Teubner, 1932. Geh. RM. 18.—. [See Review.]

*Die Einheitlichkeit des Ormmulum.* Studien zur Textkritik, zu den Quellen und zur sprachlichen Form von Orrmins Evangelienbuch. Von H. CH. MATTHES. (Germanische Bibliothek, II. 36.) xvi + 277 pp. Heidelberg: Winter. 1933. Geh. M. 17.50. Geb. M. 19.50. [A review will appear.]

*Das Ormmulum.* Textprobe mit Parallelgegenüberstellung. Zusammengestellt von H. CH. MATTHES. (Teildruck aus: H. Ch. Matthes, *Die Einheitlichkeit des Ormmulum.*) 16 pp. Heidelberg: Winter. 1933. Geh. M. —.70. [A review will appear.]

*The Survival of Geis in Mediaeval Romance.* By J. R. REINHARD. vii. + 441 pp. Halle: Niemeyer. 1933. RM. 20.— [A review will appear.]

*Literature and Pulpit in Medieval England.* A Neglected Chapter in the History of English Letters and of the English People. By G. R. OWST. XXIV + 616 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1933. 30s. net. [A review will appear.]

*The Tradition of the Nun in Medieval England.* A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of the Catholic University of America in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. By SISTER MARY OF THE INCARNATION BYRNE, C. D. P. 9 × 6, xxxv. + 235 pp. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America.

*The Macaronic Hymn Tradition in Medieval English Literature.* A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of the Catholic University of America in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. By WILLIAM C WEHRLE. 9 × 6, xxxvii. + 186 pp. Washington: D.C.: The Catholic University of America.

*Die Traktate des Richard Rolle von Hampole „Incendium Amoris“ und „Emendatio Vitae“ und deren Uebersetzung durch Richard Misyn.* Von E. SCHNELL. vi. + 191 pp. Borna-Leipzig, Noske, 1932. (Diss. Erlangen.) [A review will appear.]

*Athelston.* A Middle English Romance. Edited by A. Mcl. TROUNCE. (Publications of the Philological Society, XI.) vii + 157 pp. Oxford University Press. London: Milford. 1933. 6/- net. [A review will appear.]

*Three Chaucer Studies.* I. Chaucerian Problems: Especially the Petherton Forestership and the Question of Thomas Chaucer. By RUSSELL KRAUSS. II. The Parlement of Foules



in its relation to Contemporary Events. By HALDEEN BRADY. III. Observations on the Shifting Positions of Groups G and D in the Manuscripts of the Canterbury Tales. By C. ROBERT KASE.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , vii. + 182 + 101 + 89 pp. New York: Oxford University Press. London: Milford. 20 s. n. [A review will appear.]

*Dramatic Irony in Chaucer.* By G. DEMPSTER. (Stanford University Publications, Lang and Lit., Vol. iv., No. 3.) 102 pp. Stanford University, California. London, Milford. 1932. Paper, \$ 1.00; cloth \$ 1.50 (9/- net.) [A review will appear.]

*The Manuscripts of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales.* A critical description of their contents. By SIR WILLIAM MCCORMICK. With the assistance of JANET E. HESELTINE.  $11\frac{1}{4} \times 9\frac{1}{4}$ , xxxii. + 561 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 63 s. n.

*De Vertellingen van de Pelgrims naar Kantelberg.* Door GEOFFREY CHAUCER. Vertaald door A. J. BARNOUW. III. 262 pp. Haarlem, Tjeenk Willink, 1933. f5.90. [A review will appear.]

*The Sources of the Court of Sapience.* By C. F. BUHLER. (Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, herausg. von Max Förster. Heft XXIII.) 95 pp. Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1932. RM. 4.—. [A review will appear.]

*Der Prosaroman vom Kaiser Oktavian.* Von L. KESSLER. gr. 8° pp. 95. Phil. Diss. Frankfurt a. M. 1932.

*The Voiage and Trauaile of Syr John Maundevile, Knight, which treateth of the way toward Hierusalem, and of Marvayles of Inde with other Islands and Countryes.*  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , 254 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford, 52 s. 6 d. n.

*The Book of Fayttes of Armes and of Chyualtrye.* Translated and Printed by WILLIAM CAXTON. From the French Original by CHRISTINE DE PISAN. Edited by A. T. P. BYLES.  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , lvi. + 315 pp. For the Early English Text Society. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 21 s. n.

*Caxton: Tulle of Olde Age.* Textuntersuchung mit literarischer Einführung. Von H. SUSEBACH. (Studien zur engl. Philologie, LXXV.) xxii + 118 pp. Halle: Niemeyer. 1933. Geh. RM. 5.—. [A review will appear.]

*Die sozialen Typen im Drama des englischen Mittelalters.* Von D. TERGAU. 8° pp. 78. Phil. Diss. Göttingen 1931.

*Die Bühnenanweisungen in den englischen Moralitäten und Interludien bis 1570.* Von E. LAUF. 8° pp. 109. Phil. Diss. Münster 1932.

*The Vulgaria of John Stanbridge and the Vulgaria of Robert Whittinton.* Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by BEATRICE WHITE.  $9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , lxi. + 146 pp. For the Early English Text Society. Kegan Paul and Milford. 12 s. n. [See Review, June 1933.]

*Gentleman-Ideal und Gentleman-Erziehung.* Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Renaissance. Von A. HOYLER. (Erziehungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen, herausg. von A. Fischer u. a. 1.) 233 pp. Leipzig: Meiner. 1933. RM. 8.80. [A review will appear.]

*English Literary Autographs, 1550—1650.* Selected for Reproduction and Edited by W. W. GREG. In Collaboration with J. P. GILSON, R. B. MCKERROW, HILARY JENKINSON, A. W. POLLARD. Part. III. Prose Writers and Appendix. Plates 61—100. Supplement: Scholars and Archaeologists. Plates 100—110.  $14\frac{1}{4} \times 10$ . Privately printed.

*Antike, Renaissance und Puritanismus.* Von W. F. SCHIRMER. 2. erg. Aufl. gr. 8° pp. 235. München, Hueber 1933. RM. 9.—.

*Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry.* By DOUGLAS BUSH.  $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$ , viii. + 360 pp. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. London: Milford. 24 s. n.

*Classical Mythology in the Poetry of Edmund Spenser.* A Dissertation submitted to the English Faculty of Princeton University in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. By HENRY GIBBONS LOTSPEICH.  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , x. + 126 pp. Princeton: University Press. London: Milford. 12 s. 6 d. n.

*Edmund Spenser. A Critical Study.* By B. E. C. DAVIS. ix + 267 pp. Cambridge University Press, 1933. 12/6 net. [A review will appear.]

*Sir Philip Sidney en France.* Par A. W. OSBORN. (Bibliothèque de la Revue de Littérature Comparée, 84.) 171 + xlvii pp. Paris, Champion, 1932. [A review will appear.]

*An Introduction to Tudor Drama.* By FREDERICK S. BOAS.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ , viii. + 176 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 4 s. 6 d. n.



*Thomas Lodge and Other Elizabethans.* Edited by CHARLES J. SISSON.  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 6$ , xii + 526 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. London: Milford. 28 s. n.

*The Works and Life of Christopher Marlowe.* General Editor R. H. CASE. *Edward II.* Edited by H. B. CHARLTON and R. D. WALLER. ix + 226 pp. London: Methuen. 1933. 8/6. [A review will appear.]

*Aspects of Shakespeare.* Being British Academy Lectures by L. ABERCROMBIE, E. K. CHAMBERS, H. GRANVILLE-BARKER, W. W. GREG, E. LEGOUIS, A. W. POLLARD, C. F. E. SPURGEON, A. THORNDIKE and J. D. WILSON. vi + 286 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1933. 12/6 net. [A review will appear.]

*A Short Life of Shakespeare with the Sources.* Abridged by CHARLES WILLIAMS from SIR EDMUND CHAMBERS'S "William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems."  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$ , vii. + 260 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 5 s. n. [A review will appear.]

*On Reading Shakespeare.* By LOGAN PEARSALL SMITH. 191 pp. London, Constable, 1933. 7/6 net. [A review will appear.]

*Shakespeare.* By JOHN DRINKWATER.  $7\frac{1}{2} \times 4\frac{1}{2}$ , 118 pp. Duckworth. (Great Lives.) 2 s. n.

*Shakespeare at Work, 1592-1603.* By G. B. HARRISON.  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , 325 pp. Routledge, 10 s. 6 d. n.

*Shakespeare-Jahrbuch.* Hrsg. v. W. KELLER. Bd. 68. (= N. F. Bd. 9). gr. 8<sup>o</sup> pp. 224. Leipzig, Tauchnitz 1932. RM. 10.—

*Die Charakterprobleme bei Shakespeare.* Eine Einführung in das Verständniss des Dramatikers. Von. L. L. SCHÜCKING. 3., abermals verb. Aufl. gr. 8<sup>o</sup> pp. 286. Leipzig, Tauchnitz 1932. RM. 4.—, Lw. 5.—.

*Art and Artifice in Shakespeare.* A Study in Dramatic Contrast and Illusion. By ELMER EDGAR STOLL.  $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , xv. + 178 pp. Cambridge University Press. 7 s. 6 d. n.

*Shakespeare and National Character.* A Study of Shakespeare's Knowledge and Dramatic and Literary Use of the Distinctive Racial Characteristics of the Different Peoples of the World. By CUMBERLAND CLARK.  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , 308 pp. Hamlin Publishing Co. (31 and 35, Fetter House, Fetter Lane, E.C. 4). 10 s. 6 d. n.

*Shaksperian Scraps and Other Elizabethan Fragments.* By SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM.  $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ , xvi. + 217 pp. and xvi. plates. New York: Columbia University Press. London: Milford. 20 s. n. [A review will appear.]

*The True History of Shakespeare's Sonnets.* By LORD ALFRED DOUGLAS.  $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , 216 pp. Martin Secker. 8 s. 6 d. n.

*The Shakespeare Canon.* Part. IV. Division II. I.: The Second Part of "Henry VI." II.: The Third Part of "Henry VI." By J. M. ROBERTSON.  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$ , xviii. + 183 pp. Routledge. 10 s. 6 d. n.

*A Midsummer Night's Dream.* By H. B. CHARLTON.  $10\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$ , 23 pp. (Reprinted from "The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library." Vol. 17. No. 1, January, 1933.) Manchester: University Press. 1 s. 6 d. n.

*Papers on Shakespeare. I. — Hamlet.* By J. A. CHAPMAN.  $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$ , 39 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 2 s. n.

*How Many Children had Lady Macbeth?* An Essay in the Theory and Practice of Shakespeare Criticism. By L. C. KNIGHTS.  $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ , 70 pp. Cambridge: The Minority Press. 2 s. 6 d. n.

*Abnorme Charaktere bei Shakespeare: Othello, Richard III; Macbeth.* Von J. HOLTZ. 8<sup>o</sup> pp. 47. Med. Diss. Tübingen 1933.